THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE persistence of Fundamentalism, in the sense of insistence on the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures, must cause very grave misgivings and searchings of heart among all Christians who perceive that this type of Fundamentalism imperils the realization of the true fundamentals on which the mission of Christ's Church depends. The appeal of this way of thinking is readily understood. The traditional view of the Bible as the Word of God was the basis of private devotional study, of reading in family worship and of exegetical preaching in earlier generations. Without it the layman hardly knows how to handle the Bible, and preachers resort to topical sermons instead of concentrating on Biblical interpretation. Fundamentalism fostered reverence for and interest in the Bible as a whole, and conveyed a sense of the unity of the Bible which is sadly lacking to-day. In the present confusion and perplexities of a world threatened with destruction, men long for an authority in which they can place implicit trust. They seek such an authority in the Bible, but they do not feel safe, if they may not believe that God has preserved the record from all error. This belief in the inerrancy of the Scriptures is not based on the study of the Scriptures. It is based on the assumption that only an inerrant Bible would be a worthy vehicle of Divine revelation. The Bible must be trustworthy and accurate in every detail, if it is to be the sure foundation of Christian faith, and how much we need a sure foundation for faith to-day! And since, in fact, the Scriptures are essential for our knowledge and understanding of God's revelation of Himself to us, can we really err in claiming these exalted attributes for the Biblical record? Is it not better to claim too much for the Scriptures rather than too little? It is not surprising that so many cling to this view of the Scriptures, or that in time of crisis so many return to it. Yet to claim too much for the Scriptures is a disastrous mistake, for it leads to the All-or-Nothing fallacy. Either everything in the Bible is true or nothing is—such is the false alternative on which Fundamentalism insists. Its positives are matched by the negatives of popular rationalism. If insistence on the inerrancy of the Scriptures confirms the faith of some believers, it alienates many and makes them agnostic or atheist.

The problems presented to the Christian mind by the persistence of Fundamentalism have been thoroughly and sympathetically examined in two admirable books—the first by Father HEBERT, entitled *Fundamentalism and the Church of God* [1] and the second by Mr. E. C. BLACKMAN, on *Biblical Interpretation: The Old Difficulties and the New Opportunities*.[2]

Father HEBERT is generous in his appreciation of those who cling to Fundamentalism, and he is endeavouring to reach a real understanding with them. He is impressed by 'the splendid emphasis which those whom the world calls Fundamentalists lay on the fundamentals of the faith. St. Paul wrote, "I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." In them these words come alive, in their belief in the gospel, in their acceptance of the authority of the gospel for themselves and for their fellow-men, and therefore in their evangelism both in the home lands and in the missions abroad. No criticisms of "the Fundamentalists" can meet with anything but justified resentment when this is not understood.'

Yet Father HEBERT is quite convinced that Fundamentalism is mistaken, both on intellectual and religious grounds. He thus sums up much of the main argument of his book. 'The inadequacy of the doctrine of the inerrancy of Scripture has demonstrated itself. It is too narrow to fit the facts; it cannot be carried through in the exegesis of Scripture without resort to special pleading; it does not explain the admitted imperfection of the Old Testament; it involves a materialistic notion of truth. Above all, in being a negative word, it is quite inadequate to express the glory of the revelation of God in the Scripture.' By insisting on the dogma of Biblical Inerrancy, Fundamentalists are in danger of forgetting that Christ, not the letter of the Scriptures, is the only true foundation for faith. The gospel is the gospel of the Word of God

[1] S.C.M.; 15s. net.

[2] Independent Press; 12s. 6d. net.

Incarnate in Jesus Christ, not of a Word of God recorded in a book kept miraculously free from all errors, whether of history, science or morality. Father HEBERT is impressed by the wonder of the truth that the visible Church of God is composed of sinners, not of perfected saints. The writers of the Scriptures belonged to the visible Church. They were neither infallible nor sinless.

Both Father HEBERT and Mr. BLACKMAN assume and commend the truer, richer understanding of the nature of Revelation and of the authority of the Bible, which critical study makes possible. Mr. BLACKMAN believes that the work of Biblical scholars which so often seemed merely negative to the layman and which was necessarily largely analytic, has now reached the stage where a fruitful synthesis is possible and where the faith of the Bible in its essential unity can be convincingly presented. But the promised land of Biblical theology can only be reached by going through what sometimes seems to be the weary desert of critical inquiry. Those who have made this journey will find new opportunities for preaching the gospel to the modern world. 'There is need for a new positive exposition of the Bible which will do for the twentieth century what the Reformation did for the sixteenth. . . . If the sixteenth century may be described as the opening of the modern Western world in its early confidence, the twentieth century is to be regarded as the time of that same world's loss of confidence. It is conscious of its power, but hesitant about the proper use of this power. Precisely on this account mankind is open for a fresh confrontation with the gospel, and a fresh vindication of the claim that the Bible declares the only way of man's salvation.' This suggests the present task in Biblical exposition, which must be so to interpret the Scriptures that the Jesus of history becomes the Christ of faith, and emerges as the contemporary Master of the believer to-day.

The need for a revival of exegetical preaching is beyond question. Perhaps revival is hardly the right word, as new methods of exegesis are required. Mr. BLACKMAN'S scholarly review of the development of exegesis, in the longest chapter of his book, shows clearly the limitations of earlier methods. His closing chapter outlines the methods required in the light of modern criticism. The present task of Biblical exposition is no easy one, but it must be undertaken, and those who share this concern will find much to help them in Mr. BLACKMAN'S treatment of the theme.

One of the great principles of Greek education was what the Greeks called *mimēsis, imitation.* The Greeks held that a man could become great in art only by imitating that which is great. They, therefore, encouraged their scholars and their students from their earliest days to study and to soak in the works of the great masters of poetry, oratory, drama, history and philosophy. There can be no doubt that he who would be a preacher must follow the same method. It is, therefore, an occasion when we meet with a volume of sermons by one who was in his own way a master preacher; and we have such a volume in *Out of Nazareth,* by the late D. M. BAILLIE.[1] Let us go to that volume and let us see if we can learn from the method and technique of that great teacher and preacher.

Dr. BAILLIE was not afraid of *theological preaching.* He was never afraid to handle the greatest, and even the most abstruse, themes. And in his hands they became understandable because he understood them. In this volume he has a sermon on 'The Mystery of the Trinity'. He sets out from 1 Ti 3^{16}. God is indeed a mystery—'Father, Son and Holy Spirit, one God'. 'You feel your mind reeling back helplessly from such dizzy heights'. It is right that it should be so. Tersteegen, the German mystic, laid it down: 'A God understood, a God comprehended, is no God'. That mystery is not to be penetrated by learning, but by the humble and the childlike heart. Moreover, it is a mystery which does not depress and discourage, but which exhilarates and uplifts. But we must penetrate beyond the mystery—after all, in the New Testament a mystery is a truth unintelligible to the outsider, but plain to the initiate—to the kernel of religious belief. So, then, we come to see that God in all His mystery becomes accessible to man in Jesus Christ. Men even rubbed shoulders with this Jesus on the ways of Palestine. But the time came when Jesus was crucified. And strangely that was not the end. He rose again and He is at God's right hand. And yet, although He is at God's right hand, men found Him still amazingly present. And that presence reached its most intense and vivid manifestation in the events of Pentecost, in which it became clear that this Jesus was not now present only with those who had known Him in the flesh, but to anybody anywhere. What could that be called? For the disciples it could only be described in terms of the outpouring of the Spirit of which the prophets of the Old Testament had spoken. So Dr. BAILLIE finds the doctrine of the Trinity in the experience of the human soul—the mystery of God, the accessibility of God in Jesus Christ, the for ever unlosable presence of Jesus Christ through the Spirit.

Dr. BAILLIE has a *sense of history.* He reminds us that it is a good thing to remember what we

[1] Saint Andrew Press; 15s. net.

have inherited and what the Church has come through. He quotes Temple Gairdner of Cairo, when Gairdner was speaking of the difficulties of missionary work in Egypt: 'We're not the first to cope with this. The men who really had a hard time were the people in the first centuries when there was no Church history. We have only to look up the Early Fathers to see that our troubles have been survived before. Blessed be God for History'. Dr. BAILLIE finds his material and his message, not only in the world of thought, but also in the world of events.

Dr. BAILLIE has a clear sense of *the unity of Scripture*, of the inter-relationship of the Old Testament and the New Testament. So he has a sermon on the sleep of Jonah and the sleep of Jesus as both of them sailed the sea. 'Jonah was at ease because he thought that he had escaped from God; while Jesus was at peace because He was sure of God's love and care'. So there is *the peace of godlessness*, and there is *the peace of God*. Again, Dr. BAILLIE has a sermon in which the twin panels are the pictures of David and of Jesus weeping as they beheld Jerusalem. David was weeping as he fled before the revolt of Absalom (2 S 15^{30}); Jesus was weeping because He knew that in rejecting Him Jerusalem was rejecting her peace (Lk 19^{41}). It is only the really great Biblical scholar who can so unite the Old and the New Testaments, and it is only when that is done that the Christian faith is presented in all its continuity and in all its fullness.

Dr. BAILLIE knows the value of *the sweeping view*. The tendency of the University teacher is to turn the microscope on short sections of thought. There is a real value in every now and then turning to the sweeping view. Dr. BAILLIE speaks of the unique feature of the Christian message—the fact that God came seeking for men. He cites four witnesses. (1) C. G. Montefiore, the Jewish scholar, repeatedly singles out as absolutely new 'the conception of God actually going out in quest of sinful men who were not seeking Him but who were turned away from Him'. (2) The National Christian Council of Japan in a document which sets out the points in which Christianity goes beyond all other religions states that the unique thing about Christianity is 'Man not seeking God, but God taking the initiative in seeking man'. (3) Baron von Hügel never tired of dwelling on the Prevenience of God. He loved to quote what St. Bernard in the twelfth century said to his monks. He told them that, 'however early they might wake and rise for prayer in their chapel on a cold mid-winter morning, or even in the dead of night, they would always find God awake before them—nay, it was He that had awakened them to seek His face'. (4) One of the Barthian theologians writes: 'This is the absolutely incomparable message of the Gospel, that God comes to man, and that man does not go to God'. Here in a few paragraphs is the gathering of witnesses to prove the unique truth of the searching God.

Dr. BAILLIE knows the value of *the apt illustration*. He is a model in the art of illustrations for he uses his illustrations sparingly but genuinely illuminatingly. He tells of the day when the young George Gillespie routed John Selden and the Erastians in the Westminster Assembly, and when his friends sought to see the manuscript of the notes of that historic speech all that they found was a page of paper with one little sentence written again and again: '*Da lucem, Domine*—Give light, O Lord'. He tells of the Pope and the Cardinal watching wagons of treasure pass into the grounds of the Vatican for the Papal treasury. 'The time is past, Holy Father', said the Cardinal complacently, 'when the Church could say, "Silver and gold have I none". The Pope wisely and sadly replied: "Past also is the time when the Church could say to a lame man, In the name of Jesus rise up and walk"'. Dr. BAILLIE's sermons demonstrate how well a catholic knowledge of history and literature serves the preacher.

The great characteristic of Dr. BAILLIE's preaching is its obvious *desire to help*. So many of Dr. BAILLIE's sermons must have been delivered in the College Chapel of the University which he served; and he knew the young people to whom he preached. He knew not only their minds but also their hearts. 'How can we feel sure that we have a grasp of God as He really is, and that our prayers are really reaching the great Being whom no man has ever seen? I am sure some of you have sometimes felt these perplexities and perhaps feel them now. What can I say to you?' 'What can I say to you?'—there stands the resolution of the true preacher to understand and to help. It is not surprising that Dr. BAILLIE lovingly quotes the saying of Athanasius: 'It is only on a cross that a man dies with outstretched hands'.

We may well end by remembering that preaching is always *truth through personality*, and that Dr. BAILLIE added to his message the fact of himself, which was doubtless the most important fact of all. Those who knew him will hear again his voice in this beautifully printed and produced volume of sermons, and those who did not know him will share the depths and the simplicity of his message.

We have only dealt with the sermons in this volume of which there are twenty-one, but there are also here reprinted four of his lectures as well.

Science and Religion: Has the Situation Changed? II.

By Professor John McIntyre, B.D., D.Litt., The University of Edinburgh

II.

Our next step in discussing the relation of science to religion is to mention certain changes in scientific thought which from the side of theology suggest a new approach to some of the problems which caused so much distress in the old days.

(1) To begin with we may look at a matter which has become a topic of increasing concern to scientists, particularly to those who have looked at their activities in the light of the history of science and of the claims made for it in the past, the topic, namely, of the relation of scientific theory to reality. The former scientific dismissal of religion as illusory assumed that science described the only picture of reality and that the relation of this picture to reality was quite intelligible and capable of formulation. Two examples dealt with by Dr. E. L. Mascall (*Christian Theology and Natural Science,* 61 ff) may serve to illustrate the change. Stephen Toulmin, maintaining that previous writers upon scientific theory and method had not explained the functions which the concepts and models employed by physicists exactly fulfilled, would himself hold that their function is to enable us, with the assistance of laws of influence and principles of application which are part of the model, to correlate data already collected, and to predict further phenomena, whose occurrence or non-occurrence will be experimentally verifiable. So, too, R. B. Braithwaite, examining the structure, relations and intention of calculi, systems and hypotheses, tends to lay stress upon the deductive character of scientific systems and to deny that the logical features of the system can in any way be transferred to what the ordinary person would call ' the facts '. These two references are sketchy and perhaps even confusing but they do serve to show how far scientists have come from the idea that hypotheses and theories are literal transcriptions of the true nature of the external world. Since it was a presupposition of science about its own unequivocal relation to reality which was the ground for much of the nineteenth century objection to religion, any doubt about this relation must gravely weaken any such objection. This is not to say that science now admits the authenticity of religious knowledge, but it is to say that physics has learned not to be metaphysics and that it can no longer raise the kind of objections which it once raised.

(2) Consequently the old demands of science for objectivity and detachment now come up for fresh consideration. It will be recalled how these demands were regarded as in themselves sufficient to dispose of serious discussion of religion, which was thought to be dependent upon so many subjective attitudes. The new conceptions of the relation of scientific theory to reality as just described must inevitably lead to a re-definition of the notion of objectivity—if not to its complete removal from the field of philosophical and theological discourse. The old notion of objectivity bound up as it was with Newtonian physics can scarcely survive into a day in which reality is investigated in terms of a whole variety of models, which widely reflect what would have been termed subjective considerations in the older metaphysic. It would be difficult to contend that Eddington's spatial approach to the universe and its laws, with its emphasis upon measurability, and Milne's temporal approach to the same subject, are not determined by *a priori*, non-empirical, that is, subjective grounds. To recognize so much is not to condone such procedure or yet to say that Christianity may go and do likewise. But it does mean that Christian thinkers in talking about God are not going to be immediately stopped by scientists with a completely bogus and outmoded concept of objectivity.

The presence of subjective considerations in the field of the sciences may be detected in another form, namely, in that of the interest and conational aspects of consciousness. One could mention the scientific virtues of patience and perseverance which are prepared to labour for years upon a hypothesis which may turn out in the end to be invalid; or the humility which bows before what might be called the hard-fact-ness of reality; the integrity of quite the majority of scientists who deplore the attempt to divert their discoveries to destructive purposes. We can not remind ourselves too often of these things in a day in which science becomes the target of the moral strictures of soap-box prophets. So, too, a word must be said about the part played by human interest in the development of the sciences. In a sense all discovery within Nature is not the constructing of something which was not there previously, but the laying bare of a reality already there. But there is the other truth that Nature yields her secrets only when the proper questions are put to her, so that it is more important in some ways to find the right question than to

experiment for the right answer. It is in relation to this persistent question-asking that interest shows itself; and when we consider the truly subjective quality of interest we realize how absurd it is to go on talking about the subjectivity and detachment of the scientific attitude.

By a simple process of extrapolation the standards of scientific truth were transferred to the realm of historical science, and considerable conflict arose over the status of plain uninterpreted accounts of the facts, in no way tampered with by people with dogmatic bias. Fortunately now historians have given consideration to their own methodology, due in no small part to the influence of such writers as Croce, Collingwood, and Butterfield, and while the case for history as science has not entirely been abandoned, the term 'science' is used with precise qualification. Though the general thesis of Marxism concerning the correlation between economic status and historical truth may not be universally endorsed, it would be agreed that all historiography reflects perspectival standpoint in society, culture, politics, morality, and history, and that this state of affairs is part of the human situation. To strive to transcend the perspective or to synthesize several in a panoramic interpretation of history would be yet another expression of the human *hybris* which wants to be as God. The only way to objectivity on these terms is to compare perspectives and to search diligently for the circumstances which condition, and maybe also distort and prejudice, the perspectives. Interpretation, standpoint, presupposition—all become necessary elements in any discussion of historical truth.

Such considerations necessarily give the question of the historicity of the Gospel narratives a completely fresh orientation. We may not be able to assume that the faith of the New Testament writers necessarily conferred truth upon everything that they wrote, but at least this may be said, that their faith does not invalidate or falsify what they wrote. This liberation from the narrow influences of pseudo-scientific history has given theologians an opportunity to investigate the precise character of the contents of the Holy Scriptures, and the theological literature of the past ten years or so indicates the readiness with which they have grasped the opportunity.

(3) Determinism, which was always a heated topic in the old days, has not escaped revision in the advance of scientific reflection concerning concepts and methods. The process has taken several forms. To begin with, the emergence and acceptance of quantum physics has led to a change in the ideas held concerning causality in the natural world. Now it is not suggested that the human will escapes from the net of determinism by acquiring the characteristics of the alpha-particle—though that is how some Christian apologists have interpreted the indeterminacy principle of modern physics for human behaviour. But that type of indeterminacy is not desired for human beings; unpredictability has always been regarded as being more of a vice than a virtue; the highest forms of human behaviour are related to fairly stable, dominant, motive patterns and to definable intentions. The real gain is negative, if less imposing. It is that it can be no longer confidently affirmed that human behaviour is mechanically determined and that each of the other accounts is to be discussed independently and not ruled out *a priori* by a quite non-empirical generalization.

We have, I think, also come to see that psychological determinism leads to a type of scepticism which is destructive of the very motion from which it originated. At one time it was thought that determinism covered only the emotions and volitions of the human agent, but that somehow his intellectual processes proper were immune against it. Psychological determinism may be stated in the form that since my belief that a certain argument is valid is determined by an occurrence in my cortex of a certain type, then such belief in the validity of the argument is no proof of its validity, even when this belief is held on what are thought to be logical and, under normal circumstances, demonstrable grounds. Validity is a function of cortical occurrence. However this position has itself been arrived at by means of argument and by examination of *a priori* and empirical arguments. *This* argument is accepted not because of its logical or rational validity but because of the concurrence of certain cortical events. If the theory is true, then no arguments against it have any force, as equally no arguments in its favour have any force. Such a reduction of the whole theory disqualifies it from any place in rational discourse.

Further light has been thrown on the question of psychological determinism by some of the neuro-physiologists. The implications of their conclusions are so important that old dogmatisms are being doubted and new questions asked. J. C. Eccles (*The Neurophysiological Basis of Mind*, quoted by Mascall, *op. cit.*, 225 ff.) after a lengthy analysis of the waves recorded by electro-encephalography in the cerebral cortex and some staggering estimates of the intricacy and vastness of the neuronal network concludes with the words (quoted by Mascall, p. 233) 'The neurophysiological hypothesis is that the "will" modifies the spatio-temporal activity of the neuronal network by exerting spatio-temporal

" fields of influence " that become effective through [an] unique detector function of the active cerebral cortex '. Now while Eccles admits that this modification of the activity of the neuronal network is explicable in purely physical terms, as a normal quantum occurrence, nevertheless, he insists, the interpretation of so vast and complicated a modification in terms of ' will ' is not only permissible, but demanded by the situation. Obviously such a view does not amount to a proof of the freedom of the will; it is not the basis of a psychology of volition; but it does show recognition of the possibility of genuine volition which was not possible under the old determinism.

(4) To turn now to a further aspect of the controversy between science and religion: the subject of evolution is scarcely now a subject of serious disagreement between Christianity and science, except where Christians still maintain that the earlier chapters of the Book of Genesis are literal history. Even the Papacy (Encyclical *humani generis*) has affirmed that ' the teaching of the Church leaves the doctrine an open question, as long as it confines its speculations to the development, from other living matter already in existence, of the human body '. Such a proviso gives great latitude and might even allow the validity of a theory which draws no sharp distinction, lower down the scale than man, between living and non-living matter. It is hard to see why there should be still any genuine conflict between science and religion on this latter subject, though some Christians have felt obliged to posit a Divine intervention to bring living matter out of inanimate entities. It is a question upon which it is not necessary to give a theological judgment. A similar answer might be given to the problem of whether natural selection, acting upon genetic mutation, is sufficient to account for the whole course which evolution actually follows. The position seems to be that a number of views are compatible with Christianity, and it is wrong to regard one as more Christian than another.

(5) The break with mechanism which has taken place in the sciences has already begun to yield a harvest of fruitful thought in the field of Christian theology and anthropology. For example, there has come a new appreciation of the self, or as Professor MacMurray would say, the self as agent. This came first through the recognition of the self as will, as the spontaneous originator of action and not the transmitter of energy. While in the old conflict religion never ceased to claim for the self this power to initiate action, it was a claim that met constant protest; and when the protest ceased, the expansion of the idea of the self took place through the expansion of the notion of the self as will. This elaboration has taken the form of existentialism, in both Christian and non-Christian forms. In the non-Christian variety, the self, which knows no universal human nature to be shared with all its fellows, realizes itself through the will which rejects the heteronomy of the moral code. In the Christian form, a start has been made from the text, ' He that doeth the will shall know of the doctrine ', and emphasis is laid on the fact that Christian faith is known in the will to respond to Divine Grace and to act in the name of Christ. It expresses itself further in a whole interpretation of theology which holds that God is known only through what He does, and elaborates the theme of the mighty acts of God. The idea of the self as will has here become a vehicle of theological expression.

The liberation of the self from the enthralment of Nature has yielded a double result. On the one hand, it has led to the not unexpected optimism which pictures the self as complete lord of Nature, in due course subduing everything to itself. In some kinds of theology this absolute transcendence of the self over Nature has been re-inforced by the Calvinistic idea of the *dominium* of man over Nature. Such optimism has suffered shock in two world wars and exists only in isolated pockets of culture. On the other hand a more profound and realistic consequence of the liberation of the self from the control of mechanism has been a true appreciation of the status of self in relation both to history and to Nature. As Reinhold Niebuhr puts it, the self stands at the juncture of spirit and Nature, being a part of Nature but the only part which through its awareness of its mortality, exhibits its transcendence over Nature and its participation in eternity. This is the tragedy and danger of our relation to atomic power: as transcending Nature, we hold control of nuclear energy in our own hands, and yet, as part of Nature, which wishes to be other than it is, *i.e.*, to be as the gods, we do not have the moral nature to ensure that we shall mould this discovery to the highest ends. In other words our power over Nature is not absolute but relative; and our happiness through the control or abuse of Nature is a function of the relation of our wills to God's.

In general it might be said that the break with mechanism has opened the way for a new awareness of personal relations. Under the mechanistic metaphysic even those who disagreed with it felt guilty of slight deception when they suggested that personal relations might be something different from the only relations which scientific thought was prepared to recognize. Now there is no question that personal relations are *sui*

generis. The relation between I and Thou is something which we do not expect to find in the atomic and the sub-atomic world, and the world constituted of personal relations is a real world in its own right. The values which obtain there are under no obligation to be scrutinized by an omniscient science which makes a bogus claim to decide what is real and what is not. In theology this sort of emphasis has played a major share in the determining of the statements that have been made about human subjects, but also about the Supreme Subject, the Divine Thou, in whose Presence we all live our lives day by day. In recent years, theologians in talking about the kind of knowledge we have of God have maintained that we come closer to the truth by thinking of it as analogous to our knowledge of other selves than to our knowledge of the objects of scientific inquiry. So it has been said that our lives are dimensionally constituted—with the I-It dimension consisting of our relations to the external world, the I-Thou dimension, of our relations to others and the I-God dimension in which we are met by God, and are called to respond in obedience and faith. Each of these dimensions carries with it an appropriate attitude, and we confuse these attitudes to our peril and distress.

But the emphasis upon the self and its significance is not confined to theology. It appears also in the field of industry. In the heyday of mechanism, the conception held was that man was part of the machine, even if the most fallible part, and we are still reaping the harvest, psychological and social, of that fallacy. To-day industry is generally aware of the importance of the person in the fabric of the economy and of the necessity to differentiate him from the machine—not for the altruistic reason that it is so nice to see him enjoying himself as a person—but for the simple, hard-headed reason that a person who is treated as such does a much more responsible job than one who is de-personalized. But the psychological approach to industrial situations is not without its complications, for a person made aware of his qualities as such is less likely in the end to be satisfied with the monotony of the work he does. In fact, most people who find themselves in this position follow the very respectable devotional practice of abstraction, absenting themselves from the immediate situation and escaping into a dream-world. Whatever the end of this rehabilitation of the self within the economic scene turns out to be, it is clear that it owes its origin to the collapse of the mechanistic hypothesis.

III.

The controversy between science and religion has so often been regarded as a lugubrious affair that I feel that the balance ought to be corrected. To some extent I shall endeavour to do this by indicating in conclusion the many ways in which theology and religion have been enriched and corrected as a result of the controversy.

(1) Perhaps at once we may say that the conflict has taught theology that literalism, obscurantism, and dogmatism are no longer proper reactions to the challenge of science. They are not proper because they imply in Christianity a basic anxiety about its own foundations, and insecurity which seeks refuge in one or other of these pseudo-absolutes. If Christianity is the truth which Christ claims to be, then it has nothing to fear from the severest scrutiny of the scientist.

(2) In the course of the conflict religion has had time to realize that the only reply to determinism need not be libertarianism, unmotivated freedom of the will. It is now appreciated that human freedom operates within a structure which has many of the features mentioned by the determinists. Even economic determinism contains greater truth than the opponents of Marxism will allow, to the great detriment of their economic and social analysis.

(3) The evolution conflict brought many theologians to see the true significance of the Doctrines of Creation and the Fall. Their insights only emerge when we see that they are not primitive scientific theories which have to compete with more mature ideas, but are accounts of the ultimate nature of the world and of man's relation to his Maker.

(4) The scientific-historical method may in some instances have led to the rejection of essential parts of the gospel, but the effects of the method have not been all evil. It led to the whole critical movement in Biblical studies which has yielded an immeasurable volume of knowledge concerning the text, background, and contents of the Bible. None would have had it otherwise, and the scientific demand from the outside for that kind of method in religion certainly lent impetus to a movement which may have had its roots elsewhere.

(5) The conflict has compelled Christian theology to re-think the entirety of the faith, and to concentrate on its communication in intelligible terms. It was a typical Toynbee challenge-response situation which religion met and used on the whole as a stimulus to creative doctrinal re-construction. And there is not a single living theologian of any stature upon whom the conflict has not left its mark. So if conflict and co-existence are no longer apposite words for the relation of science and religion; then conversation is undoubtedly the word that is.

Great Themes of the New Testament

I. Philippians ii. 1–11 (*continued*)

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

(2) We have now seen how Paul sets before the Philippians the ideal of Christian unity; and we must go on to see how he urged and inspired them to overcome their dissensions and to rise to the height of that ideal.

He begins with personal appeal. Paul was not afraid to say to his converts: 'Do this for my sake!' It was perfectly natural that he should do so; his relation to his converts was not that of master to servant; it was not even that of teacher to pupil; it was that of father to child. Because there was love in his own heart, and because Paul knew that there was love in the heart of the Philippians, he does not hesitate to use the motive and the compulsion of love. Appeal was always nearer to Paul's mind than threat. In this appeal he uses a series of four phrases, all of which are in *v.* 1.

(a) *If there be any consolation in Christ*, he says. The word for *consolation* is παράκλησις, which is never an easy word to translate. (i.) It can mean exhortation to right living and to right action; it describes the pastor's urging of his people to be that which they ought to be, and that which in Christ they can be (Ro 12^8, 1 Co 14^3, 2 Co 8^{17}, 1 Th 2^3). (ii.) It can mean comfort in sorrow and in distress, that which eases the pain of the heart (2 Co 7^{13}, Philem 7). (iii.) But the real flavour of the word is to be found in the company which it keeps. It appears in company with οἰκοδομή, which means edification or upbuilding (1 Co 14^3); with παθήματα, which means sufferings (2 Co 1^7); with θλίψις, which describes the unceasing pressure of circumstances and events which are designed to hurt (2 Co 1^4 7^4 8^4); with ὑπομονή, which means 'a masculine constancy under trial', and which always has a background of courage and gallantry (Ro $15^{4.5}$). It is used in connexion with the difficult mission of Titus to Corinth (2 Co 7^7); and it appears in connexion with the command to stand fast (2 Th 2^{16}). From this it is clear that παράκλησις most often has to do with that which gives a man the ability triumphantly to face a difficult, dangerous, or distressing situation. So Paul's first note of appeal is: 'Do you wish to give me strength and courage to face the hardships and the dangers of my imprisonment, that strength and courage which are to be found only in Christ? Then live at peace and in harmony with one another'.

(b) *If there is any comfort in love*, he says. The word for *comfort* is παραμύθιον, an unusual word occurring only here in the New Testament. We shall see the flavour of this word from two classical usages of its corresponding verb παραμύθεσθαι. In the *Phaedo* Plato describes the state of the soul when it is 'fastened and welded' to the body, and 'wallowing in utter ignorance'. This is caused by the lusts of the flesh, and the terrible characteristic of such a situation is that 'the prisoner is the chief assistant in his own imprisonment'. In such a situation 'philosophy, taking possession of the soul *encourages* it gently, and tries to set it free' (Plato, *Phaedo*, 83 A). Xenophon in his essay *On Hunting* describes how hounds should be treated when they are growing tired. The huntsman must encourage and *exhort* the gentle frequently (Xenophon, *On Hunting*, vi. 25). The flavour of the word is a gentle and loving insistence on the right way and the right course of action. It is the pressure upon a man of some one who loves him to keep him on the right way, when there is much to make him abandon it in exhaustion and in despair. So Paul's second appeal is: 'Do you wish to give me love's encouragement in my present troubles? Do you wish to do something to assuage my anxiety and to enable me to go on? Then live at peace and in harmony with one another'.

(c) *If there is any fellowship of the Spirit*, he says. The words are κοινωνία πνεύματος. Κοινωνία, of course, became the great word for Christian fellowship, but in ordinary Greek it can be used for a partnership of any kind. It can be used of partnership in a business, and a man's κοινωνός is his business partner. In the Papyri a father writes to his son complaining that their κοινωνός in an allotment which they jointly own is not doing his share of the work. It can be used of the marriage partnership. In marriage two people have κοινωνία of life, and on a tablet to his dead wife a Greek doctor says: 'I *shared* all life with you alone'. The essence of the word is partnership. We think that in this case it gives better sense to take πνεύματος as a subjective genitive, rather than as an objective genitive. The phrase does not mean *a share in the Holy Spirit*; it means *the partnership and fellowship, which only the Holy Spirit can give*. So Paul's third appeal is: 'Do you wish to enter into a real partnership with me? Do you wish to enter into that kind of partnership

which only the Holy Spirit can initiate and cement? Then live at peace and in harmony with one another'.

(d) *If there are any bowels and mercies*, he says. The words are σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί. The word *bowels* appears strange to us in this context. But both to Greeks and to Jews what are known as the nobler viscera, that is, the heart, the lungs, the liver and the intestines, were held to be the seat of the emotions. So, then, the word means that kind of emotion which moves a man to the depths of his being. It describes no fleeting, superficial and sentimental feeling of emotion; it describes the emotion which penetrates into a man's inmost being.

But the real interest and impact of this phrase emerge when we investigate the Biblical usage of the word οἰκτιρμός. It occurs in four other New Testament passages, and in three of these passages the reference is to God. In Ro 12^1 Paul uses *the mercies of God* as a spur and stimulus to the Christian to devote his whole life to God. In 2 Co 1^3 God is the God of *mercies*. In Col 3^{12} those who are the elect of God must clothe themselves with *mercies*. This reference to God might be taken as only accidental, if we confine our investigation to the New Testament; but in the Septuagint out of twenty-six occasions on which this word occurs twenty-three are references to the mercy of God. The conclusion is inescapable. Οἰκτιρμός is a word which characteristically refers to nothing other than the mercy of God. Paul is appealing to the Philippians to show to him that mercy and compassion which are a reflection of the mercy of God. So Paul's fourth appeal is: 'Do you really wish to show your heartfelt sympathy for me? Do you wish to show to me the mercy God shows to those who are in distress? Then live in peace and in harmony with one another'.

Here, then, is Paul's fourfold appeal to the Philippians. 'Do you really wish to give me the strength and courage, which can be found in Christ alone, to help me to meet my present situation? Do you really wish to give me love's encouragement in my present troubles? Do you really wish to demonstrate that ours is a perfect partnership, such as only the Holy Spirit can provide? Do you really wish to show to me a heartfelt sympathy which is like the mercy of God? Then live at peace and in harmony with one another'.

(3) Although Paul does not hesitate to use the motive of personal appeal in his appeal for unity, he does not stop there. Unity in the Philippian Church may be desirable to ease Paul's anxiety and to bring him joy, but it is essential, if the example of Christ is to be followed and obeyed; Paul may begin by saying, 'For my sake', but he ends by saying, 'For Christ's sake'. So Paul moves on to the example of Christ. He introduces this final appeal with a difficult phrase in *v.* 5: τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. There is considerable discussion as to what this phrase means. The A.V. translates: 'Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus'. The R.V. translates: 'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus'. The A.R.S.V. translates: 'Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus'. Moffatt translates: 'Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus'. We have already seen that the verb φρονεῖν describes, not any single individual thought, but rather a man's whole attitude to life, the entire cast and atmosphere of his mind. The problem lies in deciding what verb is to be supplied in the relative clause ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The A.V. and the R.V. supply simply *is*; but it is clear that it is far more natural to supply φρονεῖτε, which is the verb of the main clause. It would also be much more natural to take the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in the sense which is so typical and characteristic of Paul, as expressing the intimate and close and mystical relationship of the Christian to Christ, which can only be expressed by saying that the Christian is 'in Christ'. We suggest that what Paul is saying here in a highly compressed form may be expanded and paraphrased as follows: 'Have the same attitude to life always as you have when in your highest moments you are in Christ Jesus, and when you are fully one with Him'. Paul is not making any new demand of the Philippians; he is not presenting them with a standard of conduct of which they have hitherto been ignorant; he is calling upon them to remember that which they already know, and that which in their highest moments they accept and practise.

So Paul goes on to place before the Philippians the example of Jesus Christ; and he does so by presenting a series of great contrasts between that which Jesus is eternally and by right, and that which by His own free choice He for a time became for the sake of men.

(*a*) Jesus Christ was ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, 'in the form of God', but σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, was 'found in fashion as a man'. The verb ὑπάρχειν is properly used in two ways. It describes what a person was in origin; and it is used of those qualities and characteristics which are the essential possession of a man, because they are part of himself. Paul, then, begins by saying that Jesus Christ was essentially and originally in the form of God. This is underlined by the distinction between the two words μορφή and σχῆμα. The distinction between these two words is this—μορφή is the unchanging form of a person or thing; σχῆμα is the outward and the changing appearance.

To take two examples—Africans, Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Europeans have different σχήματα; but they have all the same μορφή; they are all men. Externally they are different to look at, but beneath the changing exterior they are all men. Tulips, daffodils, roses, chrysanthemums, dahlias, delphiniums have different σχήματα, but they all have the same μορφή; they are all flowers. Plutarch uses both the verbs connected with these nouns in the seventh chapter of his essay *How to tell a Flatterer from a Friend*. The flatterer is like water; he changes his shape (συσχηματίζεσθαι) to fit his receiver. He is like a changing chameleon, or a mirror which reflects what it sees. On the other hand, he speaks of the transformation (μεταμορφοῦσθαι) of the sailors into pigs in Circe's house. The flatterer changes only his outward form; the essential form of the sailors was changed.

The distinction between these two words is well seen in the New Testament itself. In Ro 12^2 Paul insists that the Christian must be transformed from the world (μεταμορφοῦσθαι); the Christian through Christ becomes a new creation. In 2 Co 11^{13-15} Paul speaks of those who transform themselves into apostles, and of Satan being transformed into an angel of light (μετασχηματίζεσθαι). The false apostles and Satan change the externals but remain the same. So what Paul is saying here is that Jesus Christ is eternally and essentially in the form of God, and that for a time He took upon Himself the outward form of a man. His godhead is utterly permanent; His manhood was temporary. This is exactly what the writer to the Hebrews meant when he spoke of Jesus being for a little while made lower than the angels (He 2^9 [R.V. margin, A.R.S.V., Moffatt]).

(*b*) But, if Paul had left the matter there, it is clear that such a way of speaking could have been used to further the tenets of Docetism and to belittle the reality of the Incarnation; to leave the matter there might seem to say that the Incarnation was simply an outward change with no inner reality. So Paul goes on to say of Jesus μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, He 'took upon Himself the form of a servant'. The very use of the word μορφή here lays down the reality of the Incarnation. Here was no play-acting, no change of outward form, no mere alteration of appearance. Just as Jesus really was God, so He really became a man and a servant.

(*c*) Paul has still another phrase to add. He says of Jesus Christ ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, He 'was made in the likeness of men'. This phrase has two things to say of the Incarnation. First, the use of the word γενόμενος shows that the Incarnation was an episode in the life of Jesus Christ in contrast with the permanence of His glory and His godhead. Γίγνεσθαι always has the idea of *becoming*; it describes that which happens but which is not permanent. The Incarnation was a reality, but it was something which happened and ended, in contra-distinction to the endless godhead of Jesus Christ. Second, the phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων describes at one and the same time the identity of Jesus Christ with men and His difference from men. Dr. Vincent Taylor in *The Person of Christ* makes two quotations which illustrate this. Luther said of Jesus: 'He ate, drank, slept, waked; was weary, sorrowful, rejoicing; He wept and He laughed; He knew hunger and thirst and sweat; He talked, He toiled, He prayed . . . so that there was no difference between *Him* and other men, save only this, that He was *God* and had no sin'. Emil Brunner says: 'The Son of God in whom we are able to believe, must be such a One that it is possible to mistake Him for an ordinary man'. In this passage it is precisely this truth that Paul lays down, the truth that Jesus Christ was a man in the fullest sense of the term, and that at the same time He was more than a man.

(*d*) Paul then goes on to state another of these tremendous contrasts of which this passage is full. As the A.V. has it: 'Being in the form of God, [He] thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation'. The Greek text is: οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν. The word which the A.V. translates *robbery* is ἁρπαγμός. The general rule is that nouns which end in -μος are active and describe a process. It is true that that is not an absolute rule; θεσμός means an ordinance, that which is laid down; and χρησμός means an oracle, a Divine answer which is given. But ἁρπαγμός is so rare a word that it is better to retain its most obvious meaning. If ἁρπαγμός be taken actively, Paul will be saying that Jesus Christ did not consider His own equality with God as an act of seizure and of plundering. There was no necessity that He should do so, for that equality was His and His by right. We must note that that which is Jesus Christ's by right is expressed in Greek by τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, not by τὸ εἶναι ἴσος θεῷ. What is the difference? To use the phrase ἴσος θεῷ would mean that Jesus Christ possessed an absolute personal equality with God; to use the phrase ἴσα θεῷ means that the existence which Jesus Christ had in His glory was an existence which possessed and enjoyed all the privilege and the glory of God. Of that glory and these privileges He emptied Himself (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν). Here Paul is saying what He had already said to the Corinthians: 'Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor' (2 Co 8^9).

(*e*) Finally in his description of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ Paul builds up a kind of climax of humiliation.

(i.) 'He humbled himself' (ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν). Ἐταπείνωσεν is an aorist tense, and, therefore, it describes one definite act in past time. This means that the humiliation which Jesus underwent was the outcome of a deliberate and spontaneous act of choice. As it has been said, one of the most moving sweeps of thought in this passage is that for Paul the sacrifice of Jesus began, not in time when He came to this earth, but in eternity.

(ii.) 'He became obedient'. Surely it is indeed a Divine paradox to think of the King of kings and the Lord of lords becoming obedient. That He should *exact* obedience would be natural; that He should *render* obedience is the miracle of grace.

(iii.) 'He became obedient unto death'. Here is the amazing fact that the Lord of life accepted death. As Charles Wesley put it in his hymn:

'Tis mystery all! The Immortal dies.

(iv.) 'He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross'. Even the ancient world regarded a cross with a kind of shuddering horror. Cicero writes: 'To bind a Roman citizen is an outrage; to scourge him a crime; it almost amounts to parricide to put him to death; how shall I describe crucifixion? No adequate word can be found to represent so execrable an enormity' (*In Verrem*, v. 66). 'Far be the very name of a cross', he says, 'not only from the body, but even from the thought, the eyes, the ears of Roman citizens' (*Pro Rabirio*, v. 10). The sacrifice of Christ was such that He accepted a death the horror of which was beyond words to tell.

Here, then, is the final appeal of Paul to the Philippians. If Jesus Christ was prepared to accept this amazing humiliation, how can His followers quarrel among themselves about matters of honour and of precedence? Surely all human thoughts of the exaltation of self must shrivel up before the memory of the amazing sacrificial selflessness of Jesus Christ.

But Paul does not end with the humiliation of Jesus Christ; he goes beyond the humiliation into the glory. Because of what He did, Jesus Christ is highly exalted and has been given the name which is above every name, so that the day will come when the whole universe will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.

What is the name which Jesus Christ has received? There can be little doubt that the name which was in Paul's mind is Κύριος which we translate *Lord*. It is one of the disasters of religious language that the title 'Lord' is so often glibly, conventionally and meaninglessly applied to Jesus. The word κύριος has six stages in meaning, and, when we put them all together, we have to one word confession of faith. (i.) It means *owner*, as when it is used for the owner of the vineyard (Mt 20^{8}). (ii.) It means *master*, as when it is used of the master in contradistinction to the slave (Mt 25^{18}). (iii.) It is the normal *title of respect* like Sir in English, as when it is used by the courteous, but disobedient, son (Mt 21^{30}). (iv.) It was the regular *title of the Roman Emperor*, who from the time of Domitian was Κύριος καὶ θεός. (v.) The heathen regularly prefixed it to the names of their gods, as when a man spoke of 'My lord Serapis'. (vi.) In the Septuagint it is the regular translation of Jahweh, the sacred name. To call Jesus Christ Κύριος is to say that He is the master and the owner of our lives, the one to whom we give our respect, the one who is Divine, the one who is King and Emperor of life, the one who is nothing less than God. That is what a man *ought* to mean when he speaks of the Lord Jesus.

Before we end our thinking about this passage, we may note two last things about it.

It must always be remembered that Paul's purpose in writing this passage was entirely practical. His aim was not to produce a theology or a Christology, but to bring into harmony those who were at variance with one another. And yet to do so he talked about the deepest things of the Christian faith. The early Protestant theologians insisted that 'doctrines must be preached practically and duties doctrinally'. And no passage shows better than this that a man's attitude to life, to himself, and to his fellow-men is a product of his attitude to Christ. It is a common demand that we should keep the Christian ethic and abandon the Christian theology, but here is the proof that ethics and theology must always walk hand in hand.

Last of all, we may note the extraordinary fascination this passage has had for Christian thinkers in all generations. In the old legend which tells how Thaddeus went to visit Abgarus, King of Edessa, there is an account of the preaching of Thaddeus: 'I will preach in their presence . . . concerning the coming of Jesus, how He was born; and concerning His mission, for what purpose He was sent by the Father; and concerning the power of His works, and the mysteries He proclaimed in the world, and by what power He did these things; and concerning His new preaching, and His abasement and humiliation and how He humbled Himself and died and debased His divinity and was crucified' (Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, I. xiii. 19). A passage like that is instinct with memories of the words of Paul. R. C. Trench in his *Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches* quotes a passage from Nicolaus Cabasilas, a fourteenth century Greek mystic: 'His love for men emptied God. He does not remain at a distance when He calls to Himself the servant whom He loved, but He Himself comes down and seeks him.

To bring him back He who is rich came near to him who is poor. He came Himself to tell His love and to seek an answering love. He does not abandon him who rejects Him ; He does not grow angry in face of insult ; even when He is persecuted, He still waits at the doors. To show His love He does all things, and accepts His travail and dies '. There, again, are the echoes of Paul.

This is a passage whose meaning has left the most erudite theologian still seeking ; but even the simplest person can find in it a rule for life, and an inspiration to devotion to, and to adoration of, Jesus Christ the Lord.

Literature

THEOLOGY IN CONFLICT

It is tempting to substitute the title, 'theologians in conflict ' for the actual title of Gustaf Wingren's provocative book, *Theology in Conflict* (Oliver and Boyd ; 16s. net). This is, indeed, militant theology. Nygren, Karl Barth and Bultmann are subjected to what the author himself describes as both immanent and transcendent criticism. But the given title has been carefully chosen, for Dr. Wingren seeks to show that, in their varied ways, all these Biblically-concerned theological giants are in conflict with the true meaning of the New Testament

Affirming that all theologians must work with presuppositions, he seeks to show that, in the work of each of the writers studied, these presuppositions distort the truth of Scripture, and that they also render impossible the proper task of systematic theology. It is a brave attempt, to which no brief review can do justice.

The relevant presuppositions are divided into two classes, each writer being considered in turn in respect to, firstly, his ' anthropological ' presuppositions (his concept of man and his situation) and secondly his ' hermeneutical ' presuppositions (his understanding of what the New Testament is and how it is to be read). Incidentally, this method of discussion involves considerable repetition ; in the instance of Bultmann it proves to be somewhat of a hindrance.

The impossible task of summarizing all the teaching of these voluminous writers is not attempted ; within his major criticism, the author focuses attention upon one particular point. This is not arbitrarily selected, for it is one of his own presuppositions (which he seeks to show to be in harmony with the Bible) that the fundamental fact about man, to which the gospel speaks, is that he is in bondage both to guilt and to the law.

Dr. Wingren seeks to show that, in varied ways because of their varied starting-points and methods, his three opponents fail to recognize that this is man's condition. Nygren, tied to a Kantian critical attempt and to his own conception of motif-research, fails to see Agape against the background both of sin and guilt and of the law. Barth, obsessed by man's need for knowledge (revelation) rather than by his need for deliverance from bondage to guilt and law, failing to recognize the objective reality of evil, being more interested in the birth of Jesus than in His death and resurrection, and substituting ' the empty question of knowledge ' for the question that needs to be asked, is said to deprive the gospel of ' its essential content '.

Bultmann, indeed, deals with guilt, but he is accused of conceiving guilt as merely egocentricity (under the influence of Heidegger) ; he ' spiritualizes ' the law, substitutes the evidence of preaching for the actuality of the Resurrection, clings unjustifiably to the non-mythological character of sin and its forgiveness (in contrast to his treatment of the ' myth ' of the Resurrection), and, finally, makes modern preaching, ' even more abstract, separated from actual life and devoted to the spiritualized conception of the law '.

These are trenchant criticisms, and the whole has not been told there. They merit careful examination, and Dr. Wingren will expect his own presuppositions to be subjected to his own method of criticism. It might be well to start by consideration of his assertion : ' Scripture presupposes that the word is addressed to a world which does not need the Christian point of view in order to understand law, guilt, and judgment '. Much that he has to say, and not only about Barth, depends for its validity upon the truth of that assertion.

Some readers may feel that Dr. Wingren has attempted too much ; others may judge his criticisms of the respective theologians to be uneven. No serious student of theology can fail to be stimulated by this book, particularly in regard to the proper task of systematic theology and to the relation between law and gospel.

Frederic Greeves

THE NATURE AND AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE

Although important works on this theme have been written by A. S. Peake, C. H. Dodd, J. K. S.

Reid, and others, the appearance of *The Nature and Authority of the Bible* (James Clarke ; 21s. net), by the Rev. Raymond Abba, M.A., B.D., Acting Professor of Old Testament Studies in the University of Durham, is heartily to be welcomed. Mr. Abba skilfully steers a middle course between Liberalism on the one hand and Fundamentalism on the other, maintaining that the Bible ' is the record and the vehicle of a revelation, a self-disclosure of God given in an historic process which finds its climax and its fulfilment in Jesus Christ '. He effectively ends his book with an apt quotation from W. Robertson Smith who, when asked why he received Scripture as the Word of God, and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, replied : ' Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Jesus Christ, and declaring to us in Him His will for our salvation. And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul '.

This quotation is one of many in which the book abounds. Rarely, indeed, in modern times has a theological book been published in which there is such an anthology of citations ; and the remarkable fact is that so far from resenting so much quotation, one welcomes it, so apt is the selection and so widely made. In closing the book one has the feeling of having consulted a library, amid which none the less the author's opinions are clearly and forcibly expressed.

Among the themes treated are the question : ' What is the Bible ? ', its Interpretation, Revelation through History, Myth, Legend and History, Miracles, the Old Testament and the New, Differing Levels of Truth, and, finally, the Word of God. There are also valuable Notes on Recent Pentateuchal Criticism, Recent Synoptic Criticism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins which form an excellent Appendix to the volume. The emphasis lies on Revelation as Divine action finding its culmination in Christ. A courageous study is made of myth and legend in the Old Testament, although the corresponding section on the New Testament is unduly discreet. We cannot defend every narrative in the New Testament, including the account of Peter walking on the water, by an appeal to the supreme miracle of the Incarnation, since in becoming man Christ laid aside His Divine glory and accepted the limitations of a human lot.

How inclusive Mr. Abba's treatment is appears especially in the fine chapter on Differing Levels of Truth, particularly the study on Sub-Christian Morality in the Old Testament, St. Paul and his Times, and such practical themes as Military Service and Divorce. On this last issue Mr. Abba points out that legalism is contrary to the genius of Christ's teaching, that the will of God may be expressed in 'accommodations ' of the Old Testament and the New, that Jesus is concerned with attitudes of mind rather than external actions, and that Christian Ethics are derived from the Christian gospel, which is essentially a gospel of forgiveness and restoration. The book will prove to be of very great value to preachers, students, and the lay reader.

VINCENT TAYLOR

ARCHÆOLOGY

A welcome will be given to two more volumes of the S.C.M. series of ' Studies in Biblical Archæology ', written by André Parrot and excellently translated by S. H. and B. E. Hooke. The first, No. 7 in the series—*Samaria : The Capital of the Kingdom of Israel* (10s. 6d. net)—tells the story of Samaria, the capital of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, from its foundation by King Omri to the Roman period at the end of the time covered by the New Testament writings. There are chapters on the Kingdom of Israel ; Israelite Samaria in the light of Archæology ; Samaria in the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Hellenistic periods ; Samaria in the Roman period ; the Sebaste of Herod the Great ; and a final chapter on Samaria and John the Baptist. It is a clear, concise history, well told and making full use of all the Biblical and archæological evidence ; much interesting light is thrown on passages from the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament, and the book provides a valuable, easily used, background for both Old and New Testament teaching and preaching, and for the earliest Christian missionary enterprise. An interesting small point : M. Parrot assumes (p. 90 and p. 107 in the next volume) that the eighty pilgrims from the north who were murdered by Ishmael were taking gifts to the ruined temple at Jerusalem ; if so, there seems to be no reason for their murder. Ishmael was opposed to the new order under Gedaliah, with its new centre at Mizpah, and the pilgrims were more likely to have incurred his deadly wrath if they were bringing gifts to a *new* religious centre—perhaps at Bethel.

The second volume, No. 8—*Babylon and the Old Testament* (10s. 6d. net)—gives an equally interesting and careful study of the history of Babylon in two chapters, dealing respectively with the exploration of the ruins, and relationship between Babylon and the Old Testament. This English edition has been brought up-to-date by the use of Wiseman's recent publication of the Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings, and the book

shows the author's first-hand knowledge of the site, and his usual careful research. There is reference to the Lachish discoveries, of which he says 'no other archæological discovery has brought the person and times of Jeremiah so close to us'; and considerable help is given in interpreting the enigmatic Book of Daniel and the symbolic, inaugural visions of Ezekiel. The author still holds the view that Ezekiel was taken captive with the first group in 597 B.C. and did all his prophesying in Babylonia, rather than the view, which is gaining acceptance and which seems to make it easier to understand much of the book, that the prophet remained in or near Jerusalem, had two quite distinct calls, and did his earlier preaching in Palestine.

Both the books are well illustrated and contain a good, short bibliography.

The Elek Books in conjunction with Putnam's of New York and Ryerson Press of Canada, have inaugurated a series on 'Ancient Cities and Temples' by a luxuriously illustrated book on *Jerusalem*, written by Michel Join-Lambert, translated by Charlotte Haldane (30s. net). There are a hundred and thirty-four beautiful photographs, maps, and charts, and a popular account of the city from the earliest times to its capture in 1187 by Saladin, which makes good use of the Bible, archæology and the accounts given by early pilgrims, but without any attempt at a critical study of any of the sources. It is well written and translated and, although it contains so much information, is delightful to read. It is a pity that the Seal of Jazaniah (*sic*) in plate 28 has been printed from the wrong side of the negative, giving Hebrew students the illusion of being able to read the language from left to right!

Volume xxxii–xxxiii. of the Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research contains the account of the excavations at Herodian Jericho in 1951 by a team working with J. B. Pritchard—*The Excavation at Herodian Jericho 1951* ($7.50). The building uncovered appears to have been a gymnasium consisting of a large open court, a smaller courtyard, possibly covered, and between thirty and forty smaller rooms, including bathrooms and elaborate heating chambers. Pottery and coins suggest that the building was constructed during the reign of Herod I (37–4 B.C.) and remained in use through the time of Herod Agrippa I (A.D. 37–44). The book, produced with the scholarly care and precision we expect from these Annuals, fills another gap in our picture of Palestine in the time of Jesus, and the photographs of the mosaics show floors on which, at least, His contemporaries walked.

J. N. SCHOFIELD

ANXIETIES

The revived interest in the Pastoral Ministry, so marked in America, and steadily spreading in this country, has created a demand for books such as *Anxiety in Christian Experience*, by Professor Wayne E. Oates (Allen and Unwin; 15s. net), which gives a minister real insight into the handling in a creative way of the personal problems and personality disturbances of his people. For many years Professor Oates has specialized in the specific psychological and spiritual conflicts of Christian people. He gave us an excellent volume on 'Religious Factors in Mental Illness'. He has now followed this up with a volume dealing with specific anxieties. He has had an exceptionally wide experience as pastor, chaplain to mental hospitals, consultant on religious difficulties in a psychiatric clinic, and as theological professor. He has read very widely in the subject, and gives many illustrations of the kinds of anxiety a pastor is likely to meet. He is not concerned with pathological anxieties which need 'depth psychological treatment'. He has no desire to turn ministers into psychotherapists for he knows the limitations of psychotherapy. Nor has he much sympathy with what he calls 'barbiturate religion' represented by the 'positive thinking', 'the peace of mind' and the 'how to stop worrying and start living' schools. The book combines the wisdom of psychotherapy and the riches of Biblical and theological teaching in relation to man's anxieties. Here is a list of the 'anxieties' of which he writes, each with a chapter to itself: 'Economic Anxiety', 'Finitude Anxiety', 'The Anxiety of Grief', 'The Anxiety of Sin', 'Legalistic Anxiety', 'The Anxiety of the Morally Indifferent', 'The Anxiety of the Cross', 'The Anxiety of the Cross and Holy Dread', 'Anxiety and the Fellowship Concern'. After discussing the processes of each type of anxiety, he then turns to the theological and Biblical issues of that particular anxiety. For example, he sees in the attempt of the individual to overcome his economic anxiety that we get 'an emotional basis for what might be called a "works" theology, *earning security before God*': 'Faith without works is dead; works without faith is *anxious*'. He is especially good on 'Finitude Anxiety', or what is more generally called Existential or Ontological Anxiety—the anxiety of the meaninglessness of life, and the tragedy of death. That kind of anxiety can be met 'by an enlightened hedonism or a defensive stoicism, but these eliminate the reality of faith and joy in taking up one's cross'.

Every minister meets the anxiety of grief and sin. Here the wisdom of psychotherapy and the

Biblical teaching are well combined, and a minister called to deal with grief and guilt will find guidance; and also learn how these two are related. Not less valuable is the chapter on 'Legalistic Anxiety', the outcome of authoritarian religion and a false perfectionism. He has wise things to say about the self-expressionist with his false notion 'that any kind of self-control is necessarily bad'. The chapter on the morally indifferent breaks new ground.

Enough has been said to show that Professor Oates has given us a volume that will meet the demand for the kind of knowledge that makes for an effective pastoral ministry.

JOHN G. MCKENZIE

ALLEGORY AND MYSTICISM

There are many who would not hesitate to hold that Origen still remains the greatest scholar the Church has ever produced. Volume twenty-six in the 'Ancient Christian Writers' series is Origen's *The Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies*, translated and annotated by Mr. R. L. Lawson (Longmans; 21s. net or 18s. net on standing order for the series).

This is the first English translation of these two works. Neither of them exists in the original Greek except in brief fragments; and this translation is from the Latin versions of the 'Commentary' by Rufinus, and of the 'Homilies' by Jerome.

Origen's *Commentary* is well described as the first great work of Christian mysticism. 'The exquisite picture that the great Alexandrian portrays of his beloved Church is so vivid and so rich in colour that we moderns begin to see how a one-sided over-emphasis on the legal and hieratic character of the Church has tended in our own times to take from her fair countenance the blood and life that ought to give it hue and colour. Small wonder that for too many to-day she stands only for an organization, rather than what she was familiarly in Origen's thought of her—Our Lord and Saviour's mystical Bride!'

Origen's importance as an interpreter of Scripture lies in his use of the allegorical method. To all intents and purposes he himself gives us the key to his own method of exegesis: 'So . . . all the things in the visible category can be related to the invisible, the corporeal to the incorporeal, and the manifest to those which are hidden; so that the creation of the world itself, fashioned in this wise as it is, can be understood through the divine wisdom, which from actual things and copies teaches us things unseen by means of those that are seen, and carries us over from earthly things to heavenly. But this relationship does not obtain only with creatures; the Divine Scripture itself is written with a wisdom of a rather similar sort'.

Thus Scripture ever points beyond itself for Origen. For him 'the Queen of Sheba, who came from afar to feast her eyes on the magnificent splendour of Solomon and to receive from the largess of his wisdom, is regarded by Origen as a clear presage of the Church that comes to Christ from pagan lands to drink from the fountain of His wisdom'. And the fact that she comes laden with gifts is the sign that the Church from the Gentiles 'does not come empty-handed—she brings with her many a noble gift of her ancient culture'.

This is one of the most interesting volumes to appear in this series. The Introduction is excellent; the translation is good; and the notes are more than competent. This volume more than maintains the high standard of its predecessors in this invaluable series.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

LUTHER ON VOCATION

Gustaf Wingren's exposition of Luther's important, subtle and profound doctrine of vocation—*The Christian's Calling: Luther on Vocation*, tr. by Carl C. Rasmussen (Oliver and Boyd; 15s. net)—is an important contribution to Luther studies which has already won grateful recognition in Scandinavia and in Germany. It is a work of originality, but not so original as to become a mere dressing up of Luther in terms of some modern thesis. One of its merits is to relate this doctrine of Luther to his wider theological conceptions of the relation of Law and Gospel, the 'Theology of the Cross', his doctrine of the Two Kingdoms. Moreover, as in Tornvall's important study of the two powers, emphasis is given on the dynamic character of Christian existence in this world, as it becomes the battle-field between Satan and God, a battle in which each Christian is involved until the very end of the day, and in which he is sore pressed with temptation (*Anfechtung*) though the hope which is in him assures him of victory through the resurrection power of the Lord Jesus. Unfortunately, this translation cannot be wholeheartedly commended, and students must be very careful in their use of it. Thus the two important conceptions of *Anfechtung* and *Billigkeit* are misrendered, the first by 'desperation', and the second by the almost meaningless 'fairness' when what is in question is the whole conception of 'equity' as against Law, which Luther develops on his own lines, but against a long pedigree. Sometimes the

English merely limps, but sometimes the point (for example, p. 219 and note) is completely obscured.

GORDON RUPP

FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS

We are glad to draw attention to a volume which we trust will have a useful career before it —*Christianity, Democracy and Communism*, by Professor John M. Graham of the University of Aberdeen (Saint Andrew Press ; 12s. 6d. net). The first two-thirds of it might be entitled, ' What every Christian should know about Communism ', and the remaining third, ' How every Christian should regard Politics '. The first part is not exactly a history of Communism, but it deals with that history so far as that is necessary to the effort to form a conscientious critical estimate of Communism as a theory and as a revolutionary force in the contemporary world. The second part is a plea for Christian political realism in relation to the changing social institutions of our time.

The book is written out of a fund both of learning and of practical experience in local government ; and in view of the reputation of professors for obscurity, we feel constrained to add that Professor Graham writes with such clarity and conciseness as to carry the reader forward and make it difficult to lay the book down till the last page. There is no index and there is a misprint near the foot of p. 101.

STEWART MECHIE

THE FAITH OF A METHODIST

Dr. W. R. Maltby once declared : ' I am not among those who blow blasts upon the Methodist trumpet which, while they may not awaken the dead, cause grave annoyance to our neighbours '. Nor is Dr. E. W. Baker, whose Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1958 appears as *The Faith of a Methodist* (Epworth Press ; 8s. 6d. net). There is nothing chauvinist about this book. A devoted Methodist, Dr. Baker has a great concern for the reunion of Christendom, and he believes that true union is possible only as between convinced and knowledgeable members of the separated communions. So, primarily for his fellow-Methodists, he has set out his understanding of what is distinctive in Methodism, as a treasure not merely to hold but to share.

The book has a dominant theme and from this it takes its shape. Dr. Baker sees the peculiar emphasis to lie in the stress placed by Wesley on the doctrine of Christian Perfection. But whereas for Wesley this doctrine was the crown, for Dr. Baker it is also the origin and determinant. The first part of the book is given to a persuasive argument to this end, leading to the plea for calling attention afresh to this expression of Scriptural holiness. In the second part he draws the implications of the doctrine on the main articles of the Christian faith. The whole is marked by clarity and simplicity and should commend itself to many outside ' the Connexion '.

When Dr. Baker seeks to sum up, for those outside, the distinctive Methodist emphases, he turns characteristically to the Hymn Book and expounds a hymn of Charles Wesley. On the place of the hymns in the faith of a Methodist there is no need to enlarge. For many to-day, however, knowledge is limited to the comparatively small selection of Wesley hymns in the 1933 book. Dr. J. Alan Kay renders great service in an edition of a selection of little-known hymns, including a few by John Wesley : *Wesley's Prayers and Praises* (Epworth Press ; 15s. net). Behind this book lies unflagging industry and deep intuition. These qualities are seen not only in the selection and ordering of the material, in a form designed for private devotion rather than public use, but in a quite brilliant introduction pleading the relevance of these hymns for present use, and in a remarkable source index. Dr. Kay has used his authority to emend and conflate with skill and discretion. Here is an addition to the world's treasury of devotion.

Lest it be thought that the Epworth Press confines itself to Methodist themes and authors, we hasten to add that it has recently added to its ' Wyvern Books ' (2s. 6d. net) the Rev. J. R. Macphail's outline of Christian doctrine, *The Way the Truth and the Life*, originally published by the Oxford University Press and fully reviewed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxv. 226ff. This original and lucid exposition stands the test of time.

MARCUS WARD

The Rev. Leslie J. Tizard, Minister of Carrs Lane Church, Birmingham, who died at the early age of fifty-five, left the substance of a book on preaching in a reasonable state of completeness, though it would appear that he intended to add at least one further chapter. It is now published as *Preaching : The Art of Communication* (Allen and Unwin ; 10s. 6d. net). We commend it to theological students and young preachers especially. There are innumerable books on preaching, but there is a place for one like this which not only gives good advice, based on psychological study and practical experience, but also radiates the author's high conception of the preacher's calling.

We welcome a fascinating little book entitled *John Wesley among the Physicians*, by Dr. A.

Wesley Hill (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net). Its scope may be gathered from its sub-title—A Study of Eighteenth-Century Medicine. The practice of the healing art in those days was largely a matter of quaint and often disgusting traditional remedies. Wesley was not altogether free from the old ways, but his approach was experimental, and he was a pioneer in the teaching of hygiene and in the use of electricity as a curative agent. The author is to be congratulated on a book that affords a picture of old-time medical practice and casts a new light on the work of a great evangelist.

Those who wish to keep abreast of official Roman Catholic doctrine will find much to interest them in *The Teachings of Pope Pius XII.*, ed. by Michael Chinigo (Methuen; 25s. net). Here is a substantial anthology of pronouncements by the late Pope, culled from his Encyclicals, Apostolic Letters, and public addresses, and presented in a tolerable, though by no means faultless, translation. They cover almost the whole field of human life and thought, ranging from the perennial questions of marriage and the family, through art and science, education, law, and medicine, politics and economics, to what more directly touches the faith and order of the Church.

In the substance of many of these utterances there is much that deserves careful consideration, and not a little that ought to commend itself to all Christians; but readers who are not of the Roman obedience will inevitably feel that the teaching as a whole is vitiated by the underlying presumption of exclusive and infallible authority. Amid the present confusions of our world, it might to some seem salutary that at least one branch of the Church should be able to express itself undividedly on every major topic with which it chooses to deal, whether it be existentialism, atomic warfare, or the authorship of the Pentateuch. But the capacity to speak with one authoritative voice is less impressive when it is remembered that the definitions of the Roman Pontiff have authority 'of themselves, and not by virtue of the consent of the Church', and that this applies not only to his formal decrees. In the present volume there is a passage from the Encyclical *Humani Generis* of 1950 in which the theologians of the Roman Church are somewhat pointedly reminded that the pronouncements of the Supreme Pontiff in his Encyclicals also must be accorded their 'full assent', and that a question which he has decided 'can no longer be the object of free discussion among theologians'. This church speaks with one voice, not necessarily because it is of one mind, but because discipline demands that dissentient voices be silenced, or even constrained to positive assent.

Two Anglican Essays, by Lord Altrincham (Secker and Warburg; 10s. 6d. net), will evoke some discussion. The second essay provides a fair and discriminating estimate of F. D. Maurice and Christian Socialism, and to it no one can take serious exception. It is otherwise with the first essay which is a layman's plea for the removal of doctrinal tests and for drastic changes in the forms of Anglican observance and government. Lord Altrincham stands for a comprehensive Church formed by bridging the gulf between the orthodox Anglican and the Christian free-thinker. He is a friend of the Church and in that capacity he inflicts his faithful wounds in vigorous terms. Let not non-Anglicans, however, rejoice, for more than half his criticisms apply to them too. He errs in point of fact, however, when he says with reference to the Crown—'the conscientious acrobatics involved in being head of both the English and Scottish Churches must amaze the ordinary observer'. The Church of Scotland has never recognized the Crown as being in any sense its head, and the title in England since 1559 has been Supreme Governor not Head.

The book of the recent Lambeth Conference, which was issued with commendable promptitude, may be commended for general study. The daily press fastened upon parts of some of the reports of committees and gave them publicity. Here are the reports in full, dealing with the Bible, Church Unity, The Reconciling of Conflicts between and within Nations, The Family in Contemporary Society, as well as three major concerns of the Anglican Communion. There is also included general information about the Conference, the resolutions formally adopted and the Encyclical Letter from the Bishops. We wish the volume a wide circulation. The S.P.C.K. has done well to provide so much material as is in *The Lambeth Conference 1958* at no more than 7s. 6d.

Hard on the heels of Professor Tasker's '2 Corinthians' comes Dr. Leon Morris's *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (Tyndale Press; 9s. 6d. net). It takes a worthy place in a series of commentaries which has already, and rightly, earned high praise and is enjoying wide use. The production is excellent, the price modest, and the content, as we should expect from Dr. Morris—sound, shrewd and scholarly. Advantage has been taken of most of the existing commentaries in English, including several that have fallen out of use. At some points a reference to Jean Héring's volume would have been helpful.

Milestones in Books. II.

By Charles E. Raven, D.D., Cambridge[1]

That any one can be concerned with the books which influenced any of those survivals who have fulfilled their three-score years and ten seems (to me at least) hardly credible. Such books, if they have been truly formative, necessarily belong to the days before the flood which has swept away our landmarks; they have, surely, been forgotten by, or become irrelevant to, the present generation. But editors may well be wiser than us ordinary folk; and in any case it is their responsibility if we write uselessly at their request. I shall confine myself to mentioning the two books associated with and largely conditioning the two chief stages of my development though such severe limitation is obviously ungrateful to the multitude of others who prepared the way for the changes which these two achieved. The first of them devastated my childhood's faith and compelled me to recognize its ruin and my solitariness. The second, twenty years later, altered the framework of my thinking and gave me a pattern which satisfied my questing and integrated the hitherto conflicting ideas which theological and biological interests had generated. The first was Olive Schreiner's *Story of an African Farm*; the second Lloyd Morgan's Gifford Lectures —*Emergent Evolution* and *Life, Mind and Spirit*.

In regard to Olive Schreiner's great book I suspect that my experience was typical. I read it in the summer holidays of my eighteenth year, a few weeks after my birthday. My education had been substantially orthodox; at first a day-school, in a home that was Christian and happy, and a parish that was well run and intelligent. At Uppingham I had been interested but not enlightened by my headmaster's scholarship and, apart from a fleeting desire to be a missionary at my confirmation, had never associated religion with the wonder and emotion that Nature could arouse or with any answer to the questions that began to demand consideration. The traditional assumptions of Christian anthropology and cosmology were plainly unsatisfying, if not absurd; the childish faith expressed in the familiar hymns and sermons of the time had begun to seem incompatible with the ideas and actions of men and nations: it only needed the bleak presentation of life as 'a striving and a striving and an ending in nothing' reinforced by the tale of the hunter going out into 'the land of absolute negation and denial' in the hopeless search for his white bird to bring such a religion as mine crashing to the ground. The book seemed to me then and seems to me still to be one of the very few written in heart's blood, and expressing the loneliness and fortitude of our life. When two years later I found hope and laughter in Gilbert Chesterton's *Heretics* and read 'The Fallacy of the Young Nation' my debt to the African Farm was interpreted; for having remarked rather cruelly that the 'first-rate writers of the new countries are almost exactly like the second-rate writers of the old countries', he went on to make a single exception of Olive Schreiner and to relate her 'fierce and brilliant' work to the realism of the continent. For me at each successive crisis of growth I have read her great book again, and never without a drastic and salutary 'catharsis'. For she is ruthless in compelling her readers to face the stark facts of suffering and evil, and in refusing all those

[1] Charles E. Raven, D.D., Hon. D.D., Hon. D.Sc., F.B.A., F.L.S., was educated at Uppingham and Caius College, Cambridge (Scholar). At twenty-four he was a parson and a don—a Fellow, Dean and Lecturer in Theology at Emmanuel College. From 1932–50 he was Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge University, and Master of Christ's College from 1939–50.

He has been successively Donnellan Lecturer (Trinity College, Dublin); Hulsean; Noble (Harvard); Robertson (Glasgow); Halley Stewart; Herbert Spencer; Hobhouse; Gifford (Edinburgh); and Owen Memorial Lecturer (Canada).

Dr. Raven has published many important works: among the latest being his Gifford Lectures—*Natural Religion and Christian Theology*. But those who want to know him more intimately should still turn to *A Wanderer's Way* which was published in 1928. In the Preface to it he says: 'Two years ago a friend said to me, "You feel about Jesus just as you do about your birds". The remark lay in the back of my mind; suddenly popped up into consciousness; and took shape as a desire to write what the family called a "Bird-book about God". It seemed to me that religion is not less natural and much more universal than the love of birds, and that it is important for us to realize this'. *A Wanderer's Way* is his own experiences at school, university and in an office in Liverpool. It explains how 'a young man of the twentieth century came to certain experiences and certain convictions.'—Editor.

concessions to sentiment and compensation which enable the complacent to retain their assurance that for them at least the padded cell in which they have found comfort will always be available. For me certainly it was very good to have been faced with such an interpretation of life while my sensitiveness was still uncalloused.

Lloyd Morgan's two volumes came at a time when my conviction of the validity and power of the Christian tradition had been established by some years of study and teaching, and tested by service in front-line war. But the long-felt contrast between my scientific interests in biology and genetics and my theological and doctrinal commitments was still sufficiently sharp to give me constant unrest and speculation. Bergson had been the sole thinker to give me a thrill ; is there any other book so exciting and so admirable as *L'Evolution Créatrice* in the whole field of natural philosophy ? And I had worked out a close parallel between the adventures of the ' *élan vital* ' in the evolutionary process and the operation of the Holy Spirit in the history of the Church. I had been convinced that the rigidity of the Mendelian Law was not absolute or universally applicable, and had never believed that a purposeless machine was anything but a contradiction in terms. But Bergson had given me no clear picture of the mode of the creative process, no schema which specified the conditions or suggested the character of progress.

My first reading of *Life, Mind and Spirit* happened when I was actually delivering a series of talks on evolution ; and the effect was instantaneous. Pringle-Pattison's great saying that creation always involves ' both continuity of process and the emergence of novelty ' has become familiar to me even if it remained an unresolved paradox. Browning's claim for the musican in *Abt Vogler* that

> out of three sounds he frame, not a fourth sound, but a star

had shown me the appearance of novelty at a level in which I could be convinced of its truth. But as Lloyd Morgan's exposition was unfolded, I found myself saying repeatedly ' he's got it again ', ' how splendidly that fits ', ' now why didn't I realize that sequence of thought and its conclusion ? ' ' From the first illustration of hydrogen and oxygen combined under right conditions to manifest the unpredictable novelty of water to the fuller illustration of the same principle when the appropriate elements come together in their characteristic fellowship and a new emergence is accomplished ' he enlightened and convinced me. As a scheme this seemed to cover the facts from the atom to Pentecost.

Its author had, of course, both the record and the quality to meet my need. Himself a pupil of Huxley, and therefore brought up in the new Darwinian age, the pioneer in Britain of the study of bird behaviour and indeed of animal psychology, a great educationist and a convinced Christian, he had sufficient competence in philosophy and in knowledge of the development of scientific thought to give him a unique position among British thinkers. His books though occasionally liable to mannerisms in phrasing spoke to the central issues of our time. He is in fact probably more responsible than any other for the recent changes in biological thought and method, the insistence upon study of the living organism in its natural environment.

For me his influence was at once liberating and formative : it gave me a large and coherent background for my own thinking and could be taken along with the other three books which expressed similar ideas and were for a time characteristic of a way of thought—Alexander's *Space, Time and Deity*, Smuts' *Holism and Evolution*, and John Oman's *The Natural and the Supernatural*. It is one of the tragedies that the collapse of nerve after 1930, the wave of irrationalism and supernaturalism, the revival of a lightly camouflaged fundamentalism both Catholic and Protestant, and the consequent caricaturing and denigration of everything that could be labelled liberalism have combined to deflect too many of the epigoni of these great leaders from the task of formulating a reasonable theology for the new age. But all the signs of the times point to the necessity of a return to them ; if the effect of such work has had little influence upon the ecclesiastical world it has not been without its value for the scientific. If the conflict is as Dr. David Lack claims still unresolved, it has become clear that a solution could be found if books like those mentioned were accepted and expounded by Christians, their neglect in favour of a theology which patches a pre-Copernican ' neo-orthodoxy ' upon a defective understanding of science merely darkens counsel.

Tolerant Evangelism

By the Reverend J. G. Jones, M.Th., Church of South India, Dharapuram

In Dr. Shaw's penetrating assessment of Professor Arnold J. Toynbee's *An Historian's Approach to Religion* (The Expository Times, lxix. 274–277), there occurred the following sentences: 'Indeed to represent Jesus as the sole Saviour of mankind Toynbee regards as an example of what he calls "parochialism" and "self-centredness", and for Christians to represent God as revealing Himself to one particular people or person in any unique way he regards as a species of what he calls "self-idolization" or "megalomania", indeed of spiritual "arrogance" and "pride".'

To a missionary in India, this verdict of Toynbee's has an extraordinarily familiar ring. One cannot help suspecting that he has been influenced by modern Hindu apologists, who have been making the same kind of judgment for quite some time. The suspicion deepens when Toynbee goes on to define the different Higher Religions as 'alternative approaches to the One True God . . . offering diverse partial glimpses of an identical Beatific Vision.'

I

That there is need for tolerance, most of us would not wish to question, but it is a matter of some importance that we examine the presuppositions upon which our tolerance is based.

For my own part, my belief in tolerance rests upon two foundations: the first is religious and the second is philosophic. The religious foundation is grounded in the life and teaching of Jesus. Christ is the perfect Exemplar of tolerance, as I understand the word. Though Christ holds deep and uncompromising convictions, which eventually lead Him to the Cross, He never attempts to coerce others to His way of thinking. The disciple who desires to call down fire on those who reject the Lord is told quite bluntly that he does not understand the spirit of the Lord he would defend. The disciple who seeks to use the sword against his Lord's assailants has to be told that those who take the sword shall perish with the sword. It is not necessary to enlarge upon this theme. It is clear that Jesus Himself acknowledges and respects the right of every man's freedom of conscience and of choice. This attitude is in striking contrast to that of Muhammad, who exhibits a fierce and fanatical hatred of those who reject him, and who regards the use of physical arms against them as legitimate. Indeed, he exhorts his followers to embark upon holy war or *jihad* as a religious duty.

The philosophical foundation provides a potent 'rationale' for the principle of toleration. Locke presented the principle in embryo when he wrote '. . . it is unavoidable to the greatest part of men, if not all, to have several opinions, without certain and indubitable proofs of their truth . . . it would, methinks, become all men to maintain peace and the common offices of humanity and friendship in the diversity of opinions, since we cannot reasonably expect that any one should readily and obsequiously quit his own opinion and embrace ours with a blind resignation to an authority which the understanding of man acknowledges not.' Locke's point that it is impossible to provide an indisputable proof for several of our opinions was reinforced by Kant's division of the world into the 'phenomenal' and the 'noumenal,' and his contention that the latter is quite beyond the reach of pure reason. We are prisoners within the confines of our sensory mechanism, our bodies, and there is no possibility of escape. We may believe that things in themselves are faithfully represented in our perceptions of them, but we can never prove it. In other words, there is no hope of demonstrating objective reality from subjective experience. A glass of water viewed by the naked eye may appear to be perfectly clear. The same water viewed through a microscope will look quite different. The moon appears to the naked eye as a ball of light, but takes on a different aspect when viewed through the telescope. In either case, who is to say which of these appearances is the truest representation of reality? The physicist assures us that, wherever we look, if it were possible to carry the process of magnification far enough, we should eventually come upon a world of teeming electrons, which is far removed from anything that is actually presented to the eye. But again, who is to say that the world of electrons is any more 'real' or 'objective' than the world we habitually perceive? When once we admit the impossibility of proving that the world as we see it is the world as it really is, we have achieved a sure basis for the principle of toleration.

II

The argument for tolerance advocated by Professor Toynbee and his Hindu predecessors is of quite another type. It is based upon a metaphysical assertion—namely, that the Higher

Religions are 'alternative approaches to the One True God . . . offering diverse partial glimpses of an identical Beatific Vision.' This assertion is quite dogmatic and beyond the possibility of proof. Yet if this metaphysic be rejected, the whole argument for tolerance which is built upon it loses its validity. For my part, I entirely repudiate this metaphysic. I can discover no convincing evidence either in the dogma of the various 'Higher Religions' or in their practical social and religious outworkings for the contention that they are in fact 'offering diverse partial glimpses of an identical Beatific Vision.' To demonstrate in detail that there is this deep inner identity betwixt the religions of the world requires the kind of mental dexterity shown by Mrs. Annie Besant. Serious scholars have not found it convincing.

Another point is worth making. An argument for tolerance which is itself based upon a metaphysical speculation—for example, that the Higher Religions of the world are basically one—is unstable. It depends for its validity upon common acceptance of the metaphysic. When, for instance, the Hindu finds that the Christian is not prepared to accept his outlook, he is quite capable of using his argument for tolerance as a justification for intolerance. His argument runs briefly as follows: Hinduism is quite prepared to embrace truth from any quarter; it acknowledges the right of each religion to its own existence; it does not 'proselytize.' Christianity, on the contrary, is exclusive in its claims (which it has no right to be on Hindu presuppositions) and seeks to convert the Hindu. This is a threat to Hindu *dharma*. Therefore 'proselytization' cannot be tolerated. It is not usually said how 'proselytization' is to be prevented, but it is obvious that any serious attempt to enforce such a ban would be a denial of personal freedom of conscience and an abrogation of religious liberty—and this in the name of Hindu tolerance.

III

It is Toynbee's contention that the total claims which Christianity has habitually made represent a form of spiritual 'parochialism' or 'self-centredness' or even 'megalomania'.

Let us consider for a moment the man whose vocation it is to educate others so as to cultivate in them a taste for and a lively appreciation of music. He may start with no more than a fondness for melody and a sense of rhythm on the part of his pupil. But from these crude beginnings, he manages to purge the musical taste of its immaturities and crudities and to mould it into something fine and discerning. Are we to say that this man is guilty of 'parochialism' and 'self-centredness' for seeking to impose on others his own musical standards? Should we not be more inclined to say that he is performing a valuable social and humanitarian function in that he is sharing his own gifts with others and enabling them to develop and enjoy a faculty which might otherwise have remained a very poor and imperfect thing.

Now let us consider the case of a doctor who goes to some primitive area and seeks to inculcate modern ideas of medicine. If a cholera epidemic threatens, he will seek to teach everybody in the area that the 'country remedies' and religious rites which they are accustomed to regard as efficacious are in fact useless. Only the vaccine which he has brought with him from another land will be effective. Is he guilty of 'self-idolization' and 'megalomania' because he thus seeks to impose his ideas about medicine upon those of another persuasion?

This brings us to the heart of the matter. Christ compared His work with that of the physician. He was no more satisfied that all religions are equally efficacious than we are that all medical systems are equally effective. He was born a Jew and lived in a Jewish environment. Judaism is generally reckoned to have reached a higher spiritual level than any of its competitors in the ancient world. Yet Jesus did not regard it as in any way satisfactory. It was the old garment to which His new cloth must not be stitched. Jesus made total claims for Himself. He said 'Come unto me. . . .' He described Himself as the Way, the Truth and the Life. Would Professor Toynbee regard this as 'spiritual arrogance' or 'megalomania'? If he is to be consistent, he surely should. Yet this can hardly be the case since he regards Christianity as the highest and best religion in history. Whence this strange contradiction? How can that religion be the highest whose Founder stands condemned (on Toynbee's premises) of 'self-idolization'?

IV

Tolerance does not imply belief in the central identity of the world's religions any more than in other metaphysical propositions. On the contrary, tolerance has its strongest rational basis in the recognition that metaphysics and theology lie beyond the realm of proof. It is possible by means of speculation and what is regarded as Divine revelation to arrive at many different conclusions about the nature of reality, none of which can be proved. It therefore becomes us to acknowledge each man's right to his own religious convictions. But the acknowledgment of that right does not imply belief that another man's religion is as valuable as mine and even ultimately indistinguishable from mine. I am fully entitled to regard his religion as diametrically opposed to mine and

as a completely misleading representation of reality —but I must accord to him the same right. If I am sincere in my convictions, I shall seek to convert him to my belief, but I must accept that he will also seek to convert me if he is equally sincere. Liberty of conscience surely demands that there shall be this freedom for all religionists to propagate their faiths, provided only that they do not do violence to the liberty of conscience of others in the process. It is only by the free interchange of religious convictions in a spirit of mutual toleration that truth can eventually hold universal sway. That is the basic justification for evangelism —provided it be tolerant evangelism.

Contributions and Comments

The Migration of Abram

In his review of Professor Wick Broomall's *Biblical Criticism* in The Expository Times, lxix. 328 [August, 1958], Professor Rowley wrote: 'The Old Testament plainly says that Abram left Haran before the death of his father (Gn 11^{26} 12^{4} 11^{32}), and there is no question of textual uncertainty here; the New Testament equally plainly says (Ac 7^{4}) that it was not until after his father's death that he departed. Both cannot be infallibly correct, and it is wiser to abandon a theory of inspiration than to charge God with error' (p. 329).

But there is textual uncertainty here, for the Samaritan Pentateuch at Gn 11^{32} reads 'one hundred and forty-five', not 'two hundred and five', years. As F. F. Bruce points out, Philo seems to share the Acts tradition, and he suggests that there may well have been a LXX reading, now lost, lying behind both Acts and Philo. 'There are other passages in Stephen's speech which presume readings no longer extant in our LXX texts but preserved in the Samaritan Pentateuch' (*Acts*: Greek Text [1951], 162). We cannot afford in the present state of textual study to be cavalier even with unsupported Samaritan readings. When Samaritan Pentateuch, Philo and New Testament agree together against the Massoretic Text, it is unwise to use the Massoretic Text to support the statement: 'The Old Testament plainly says'.

J. W. Wenham

Tyndale Hall, Bristol

Mr. Wenham is content with slender evidence for what he wishes to accept, but omits to note that all other ancient versions agree with the Hebrew text—LXX, Vulgate, Syriac and Targum. The only evidence for the figure one hundred and forty-five is the Samaritan, and no trace of the supposed LXX reading in agreement with this is known. It is an accepted principle of sound textual criticism that where an obvious reason for the change of A to B exists, but no obvious reason for the change of B to A, then A is to be preferred. In this case the change of one hundred and forty-five to two hundred and five would be difficult to explain, whereas the change of two hundred and five to one hundred and forty-five would find its obvious explanation in the fact that the migration of Abram is recorded after the death of Terah, and the alteration of the figure places the death chronologically immediately before the incident that follows. When to this is added the whole weight of the textual evidence against the Samaritan, no serious textual uncertainty remains. That Philo and Acts show familiarity with the view that the migration of Abram followed the death of Terah provides no evidence for the reading one hundred and forty-five, which neither of them mentions. It could equally well have arisen from the simple fact that the one is recorded after the other in the pages of Genesis. I am happy here to find myself in agreement with Principal E. F. Kevan, in so conservative a work as *The New Bible Commentary*, published by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship: 'The facts are that Abram left Haran when his father was 145 years of age, and Terah lived on another sixty years after Abram left him. Stephen's speech merely gives the facts in the order in which they were narrated in Genesis, not in the chronological order of events'.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

The Cry of Dereliction

I greatly appreciated the contribution of Dr. David Read on 'The Cry of Dereliction' in The Expository Times, lxviii. [June, 1957]. His holding both to a real abandonment of the Son at the Cross, and to the deity of Christ, is gratifying because it does justice to the Biblical testimony.

But in the interest of precision I must take exception at one point. That is in his use of the word 'absolute.' The Cry from the Cross, he writes, 'shows us absolute Innocence in absolute abandonment.' To this I would reply: Absolute sinlessness, yes; but absolute abandonment, no.

Dr. Read well recognizes that such an abandonment is 'a conception logically irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Trinity.' He is aware that at

'the deepest point in the expression of atonement —logical formulae are . . . impossible.' Nevertheless logic cannot be ignored. There is a difference between a paradox and a clear contradiction. A breach of a *kind* of unity in the experience of the forsaking of the Son by the Father there may be, and this is paradoxical in the face of the unity of the Father and Son in the ultimate being of God. But to say *absolute* abandonment would appear to signify nothing less than the rupture of the being of God, or the term absolute does not mean absolute. This would mean flat contradiction, thus: the Trinity is absolutely united in the being of the one God. The Son was absolutely abandoned by the Father.

I would suggest two foci which must control our thought in the reading of the New Testament witness. (1) There is a real forsaking or Christ's words do not represent a fact, quotation from Ps 22 or no. Yet (2) an *absolute* breach there cannot be. Not only would this imply a rupture in the Trinity as a deduction, but Christ is recorded as very shortly committing Himself to the Father in filial trust.

May not the words of R. W. Dale in an appendix to his old work, *The Atonement*, have something for us at this point: 'The sense of the entire withdrawal of the light and joy of God's presence, whatever its cause, . . . [even though] it was the direct result of an actual suspension of the free personal manifestation of the Divine presence to the soul of Christ, is perfectly consistent with the continuance of that deep relationship to God which no loss of the consciousness of God's presence could destroy' (23rd ed. [1904] 473).

NELSON B. BAKER

The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

A Man with a Little Donkey

BY RITA SNOWDEN, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND

LOTS of boys and girls live in the beautiful city of Melbourne, and lots more visit it at holiday times. There, beneath great trees—flecked with sun and shadow—is something that no boy or girl, who loves brave deeds, can ever forget. It is a bronze memorial, and there is no other in the world quite like it. It shows a brave, kind man with a little donkey. The little donkey, with his long ears up, has his head down, for he is carrying a heavy load. His load is a sick, wounded man.

I wonder if you know the name of that brave, kind man with the little donkey? No, he is not called 'The Good Samaritan'—though that would be a fine nickname for him. His real name is John Simpson—Private John Simpson. An inscription tells us that. First, it gives us his name: 'Private John Simpson, 3rd Field Ambulance, A.I.F.' Then it tells us: 'After landing at Gallipoli'—in the old War days—'Simpson, with his little donkey, worked alone day and night taking water to the front line and carrying the wounded back to the dressing station. He and his little donkey were killed by a shrapnel shell on 19/5/15. Simpson was mentioned in despatches by Sir Ian Hamilton, Commander-in-Chief of the Mediterranean Expeditionary Force.'

That's all the inscription says—but that's enough, isn't it? It tells us the most important things—that he was not only a kind man, but a very brave one—just like that other kind man with the little donkey who came down the dangerous way from Jerusalem to Jericho and paused to pick up the poor man whom the robbers had beaten up. You remember his story—how they wounded the poor man, and departed leaving him half dead. The Good Samaritan's story is one of the best loved in the whole world. Jesus told it first, and it is written down now in the pages of our New Testament so that it can be remembered for all time.

As boys and girls stand looking at John Simpson —as he is shown in the sculptor's bronze in Melbourne, under those great trees, flecked with sun and shadow—they seem to be seeing that other brave, kind man, the Good Samaritan, coming down from Jerusalem to Jericho. For John Simpson, coming down his dangerous way, seems just like him. Walking slowly beside his little donkey, patiently holding on to the poor, wounded man they are carrying to safety, he is doing what Jesus said is one of the most wonderful things in the world—he is showing compassion. 'Compassion' is a word we don't often use these days—though Jesus used it. Read what He says: 'he had compassion on him' (Lk 10^{33}).

But every boy and girl who looks on John Simpson there, beside his little donkey, knows what it means; and hopes to be brave and kind enough, too, when the chance comes to show compassion to somebody in trouble.

Revolution

By Principal J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D., The Baptist College, Cardiff

One of our great Baptist scholars, Dr. T. R. Glover, used to like to quote a little boy who said that the Bible began with Genesis and ended in Revolutions! He meant 'Revelation,' of course, but I think it was a very good mistake to make. The Bible does end in revolutions!

What is a revolution? The word means a 'turning around.' The older ones among you will have heard of the French Revolution. The dates (I've just looked them up!) are 1789 to 1795. The poorer classes in France were being ill-treated by the noblemen and clergy, and there was a grim uprising. The end of it all was a turn about in the government of France.

In this country we had our Industrial Revolution in the last century. Up to a hundred and fifty years ago the people of Britain worked on the land. Some were farmers and shepherds and others worked at crafts which were associated with that kind of life. Then machinery came. Steam had been discovered and later what we call the internal combustion engine was invented. And that kind of thing completely changed our way of living. It brought great prosperity to our country and a good deal of ugliness, too. It was a turn around. And that is why we call it the Industrial Revolution.

What revolution, then, does the Bible give rise to? Let me tell you of one. In the north of India there is a district known as the Lushai Hills. When Christian missionaries first went there some seventy years ago the people were head-hunters. A few years ago a choir from Lushai toured America giving remarkable performances of Handel's *Messiah*!

I could repeat examples. There is no doubt at all that the Bible can make wicked people good and wild people God-fearing. The little boy was right when he said it ends in revolutions!

The Christian Year

Sunday next before Advent

The Ten Virgins

By the Reverend W. B. J. Martin, Visiting Professor of Homiletics, The University of Chicago

'Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom. And five of them were wise, and five were foolish.'—Mt 25^{1-13}.

Many difficulties associated with this parable disappear when it is read as a story taken from life, the description of a familiar event in first-century Palestine. This was how people behaved at a wedding ceremony in those days; there was a troop of bridesmaids whose duty it was to go forth and welcome the bridegroom; because marriages were held at night, they carried lamps; because Eastern people had little regard for time, some silly girls were caught napping. There was nothing unusual in all this; these things happened time and again. So, it isn't necessary to think that Jesus approved of everything He described. He could hardly have approved, for instance, of the churlish attitude of the wise bridesmaids who refused to lend their foolish sisters a drop of oil. Or of the indignant bridegroom who refused to let the late-comers in, boorishly shutting the door in their faces. But that's life! That, unfortunately, is how people do behave. The worldly-wise and the careful are not always as sympathetic as they might be with folly, especially if it threatens to spoil the party for themselves. Indignant hosts, who have gone to some trouble to arrange a festivity, do say, 'If you can't turn up on time, don't bother to come at all.' But it is clear from other contexts that Jesus did not share these views. What He is doing in this parable is not passing judgment but telling a story which is quite recognizably a slice of life. He is using it simply to point the moral, 'Be prepared,' 'Don't be caught out,' 'Keep your wits about you.'

Or is He? It seems a very elaborate way of making a simple point. This is one of the most elaborate and detailed stories Jesus ever told. All for the sake of enforcing the simple lesson, 'Be prepared'. Jesus wasn't a scout master. He was the world's profoundest religious teacher. He was not given to mouthing platitudes, or purveying worldly-wisdom, or using complicated illustrations to stress self-evident truths. Certainly the note of warning is heard throughout this tale, but so it is elsewhere in the words of Jesus. Here it is presented at such length that one is forced to ask, Why? What sort of preparation? Preparation for what?

1. The first thing that emerges is that it was preparation of a special kind—preparation for the entry of a bridegroom, for admittance to a wedding-feast. Men are accustomed to warnings against trouble. We all realize that it is wise to prepare for the worst, for the rainy day, the hour of danger, the entry of the undertaker. But here is a call to be prepared for life, for joy, for the *best* that can happen to us. Look out! says Jesus, for the great invitation to festivity and rejoicing may catch you unawares. We are apt to assume that any fool can be happy, and it takes little or no preparation to enter into the joys of life. That was not Christ's verdict. Like the man in His other

parable, who attempted to get into the feast without a wedding garment, we are warned that we must not expect to stroll into joy with our hands in our pockets. A similar point is made in the parable of the Prodigal Son, where the Elder Brother is shown outside the festive home, locked out by his own attitude. 'He was angry and would not go in.' Undisciplined emotions, careless living, and casualness do shut men out of many fine experiences. The great occasions of life—listening to great music, viewing great pictures, meeting great personalities—do not render up their full benefits without preparation of heart and mind.

But there is more than a general warning here. One of the key words of the parable is the word 'bridegroom.' Christ's first hearers could hardly have escaped its implications. They must have recalled at least one occasion on which Jesus used this word concerning Himself. Had He not called His disciples 'children of the bridechamber'? Had He not defended their light-heartedness by asking, 'Can the children mourn while the bridegroom is with them?' It is He who makes life a marriage-feast and it is His entry they were warned not to miss. That such a warning was not superfluous is shown by the pitifully small percentage of people who met Him 'in His habit as He lived' and failed to be awake and alert to His significance. Because their lives were preoccupied, their expectation drowsy, 'their eyes were holden that they should not know Him.'

2. But that is not all. The warning about preparation is connected with a tarrying. 'While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept,' but the foolish virgins woke to find that their oil was gone. They were prepared for the short-term joys of life but not for any that demanded reserves and patience. They *should* have been prepared, for such delays were commonplace in first-century Palestine. where men did not live strapped to a wrist-watch. Wedding ceremonies tended to be long drawn out, and had they given the subject a moment's thought they would have realized that it was well to have oil in reserve. Perhaps the most neglected verse in the Bible in these days is 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' What shuts many people out of the feast of life is the sin of impatience; the unwillingness to wait, to mature, to grow, to reap the benefit of long-term plans. There was an old revival hymn which ran, 'Take time to be holy.' May we not say, 'Take time to be happy'? Immediate satisfactions are all some people care about, but they do not wear well. Lust can be 'enjoyed' in a moment, love is a creation of slow growth. Pleasure can be plucked from the tree of life in passing, blessedness depends upon character. Henry David Thoreau said: 'Nothing can be more useful to a man than a determination not to be hurried.' What a word for a world dominated by hire-purchase, French without tears, privileges without responsibilities, knowledge without insight!

3. Looking again at the parable more closely, I wonder how much significance there is in the opening word, 'then'? The parable begins '*Then* shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins.' The 'then' seems to connect the story with what preceded it, namely a series of discourses concerning the 'last things,' a dark prophecy of nation rising against nation, of famine and pestilence, of the emergence of false prophets, the delivering up of the saints to persecution, the imminent fall of Jerusalem. 'Then,' said Jesus, when the foundations are shaken, when crisis follows crisis, when earth rocks and trembles under men's feet, and men's hearts fail them for fear, *then* the situation with regard to the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto ten virgins who went forth to greet the bridegroom, who went out to enter into the joy of their Lord. It is deeply significant that the only people who to-day live in the spirit of these words are—the Communists! In a day of social upheaval and frightening change, when many Christians view the break-up of the established order with alarm and seem occupied in bolstering up the status quo, the communist heart leaps up at every new evidence of dissolution, leaps up to meet the bridegroom in the world's midnight hour. Communism rejoices at every sign of the breakdown of Capitalism, every lynching, every outbreak of racial hatred, not only because it can turn these things to the advantage of the Party, but because it is deeply persuaded that they are birth pangs of a new order. It is persuaded that there is a dialectic at work within history which nothing can stop and with which it is its task to co-operate. When Jesus counselled men to go forth to meet the bridegroom in the world's midnight hour, He did it out of His strong conviction that God was in charge of history. 'Things are shaken that the things which cannot be shaken may remain.' The parable then becomes a reminder that there are two attitudes possible in a time of crisis: wise and foolish. The path of folly is to live for the moment, overcome by the stress and strain of the moment. The path of wisdom is to anticipate the future with confidence, to ask of the On-going Risen Christ, 'Lord, whither goest thou?' Gladstone was once asked how he conceived of the statesman's task. He replied, 'The task of the statesman is to find out where God is going next and to head in that direction.' Perhaps this is where the statesman differs from the mere politician? The politician is concerned with the next election and with

reassuring people. The statesman is committed to long-term plans, and knows that nothing remains static, that every solution throws up another problem, yet nevertheless rejoices in marching forward with history and not against it. The counsel of Jesus is not a call to evade a fearful judgment, but to be present at the birth pangs of a new order. 'Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.'

First Sunday in Advent

Two Advents—One Christ

By the Reverend Douglas Stewart, M.A., London

'For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ.'—2 Co 5^{10}.

1. Christians in all ages have found it excessively difficult to hold the two main words in our text together. Either they have clung to the conception of judgment and lost their sense of Christ, or else, from their vision of Christ they have silently dropped the element of judgment.

We discover this difficulty especially when we come to Advent. We cannot easily reconcile the first Advent with the second, or the second with the first. In His first Advent our Lord comes in weakness, in humility—and that for us is the essence of Christ; in His second He comes in power and great glory—and these exclude meekness and love. Christians of all ages tend to divide into first Adventists or second Adventists; into those who conceive of mercy without judgment and those who conceive of judgment without mercy.

In the Middle Ages the emphasis was undoubtedly upon judgment. Whether we look at mediæval theology, or art, or drama, or letters, we are confronted by the Last Judgment. Michael Angelo's great fresco in the Sistine Chapel and Dante's *Divine Comedy* are merely the greatest examples of the thought world of mediæval man. But are we misjudging that great age when we suggest that, while they were vividly aware of judgment, they were not vividly aware of Christ? The Christ we know from the Gospels was relatively unknown and the judgment-seat was occupied by a figure erected partly out of the pagan past, partly from Jewish Apocalypse, and partly from the dark fears of the unconscious mind.

In modern times the emphasis is reversed. The recovery of the Bible has meant the recovery of Christ. The whole weight of modern scholarship has been bent towards the recreation of the historic past and in particular the recreation of the Jesus of history. The plain fact is that we to-day know Jesus 'after the flesh' much more fully and much more accurately than did the second generation Christians living still in the first century.

But in the process we have lost the eschatological significance of Christ. For us He is the Galilean prophet, healer, teacher, the historic man. We are no longer aware of Him as 'at the right hand of God' and 'coming in the clouds of heaven.' If mediæval Christianity suffered from Christlessness, ours suffers from sentimentality. The fullness of the truth is that 'we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ,' giving equal force to both words. First Advent and second Advent are equally important and they are united in Christ. Christ who came will come.

2. We need to remind ourselves of the element of judgment in the first Advent. 'There was no room in the inn.' 'Take the young child and flee into Egypt, for Herod will seek to destroy Him.' The coming of Jesus in weakness and humility is immediately a judgment upon this world with its insensitive cruelty and power politics. And that note is continuous throughout the Gospel. By His coming amongst us He is our judge. The inevitability of the Cross lies here. It is man's judgment of Christ and Christ's judgment of man. 'Now is the judgment of this world.' The very names Bethlehem, Galilee, Nazareth, Calvary are a judgment upon us.

And we should discern also the immense consolation of the judgment of Christ. It will be Jesus Christ, who was born long ago in Bethlehem, who walked the roads of Galilee and the streets of Jerusalem: He who healed the sick and had compassion upon the multitudes, who will judge the world. At the last day I shall stand, not before some awful cosmic figure, some power from the frightening deep, but before Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. No trick will be played and no terrifying substitution will be made. Surely this is the most consoling thought of all.

Far too many sermons have been preached on the theme 'What think ye of Christ?' The real question is 'What does Christ think of me?' That is the *last* judgment, the last word. And many of us would find immeasurable emancipation if we could believe it. The judgment of friends, neighbours, associates and enemies; the judgment of conscience itself: all these will be set aside. Only one judgment matters—the judgment of Christ. There is a thought to live with.

3. What does Christ think of me? About this I propose to say two things. Firstly, consider the relationship in the Gospels between Christ and the outcast. Then, as now, there were many types of outcast. There were those physically outcast—the leper. There were those morally outcast—the

harlot. There were those politically outcast—the publican. There were those socially outcast—the children. There were those racially outcast—the Samaritan. Each one of these in turn became a centre of controversy between our Lord and the society around Him. And in every case He stood with the outcast against the social judgment of the time. And here we are guided also by the great judgment parable. 'Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee?' 'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these, ye did it not unto me.' 'We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ.'

I suspect that many of us have a prepared defence. We hope to tell Christ about our virtues, and offer a defence of our weakness. We shall admit certain vices at once to forestall criticism and then hurry on to expatiate upon our finest hours. But it may be that our Lord is not interested in either our vices or our virtues, but in something that lies beneath and behind them, in the loving or in the pitiless heart. Therefore before the judgment seat what can I say but 'Lord have mercy upon me?' And how can I say 'Lord have mercy upon me' if my life, my heart, have been locked against mercy all my days?

The second element in the judgment of Christ may sound stranger to modern ears. It arises because we stand before the judgment seat of the crucified; because He said, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross.' Consider that against the philosophy of the world in which we live, the mental atmosphere which we breathe day by day. Consider it against the unexamined assumption of most modern societies. The assumption is that pain in all its forms is the greatest evil man has to face and that it should be avoided at any cost.

The most intimate desire of modern man—his insidious temptation which he never considers a temptation at all—is the desire for a painless existence. He is restlessly seeking the perfect anæsthetic against life. The negative ideal of countless millions is just that. The real prayer of their being is that God will provide that they may live and die without suffering—physical, mental, material or spiritual. It is not wealth we desire, only security; not great possessions, only comfort; not the satisfaction of passionate vices, just happiness. We don't want to sin great sins, but to escape from unpleasant experiences.

'Why not? What's wrong with that?' we protest. We tell our wives and they sympathize. We tell the doctor and he understands. We tell our friends, and all agree. But—'We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ.' How can I who refuse to bear my cross stand before the judgment seat of Christ? 'He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.'

Second Sunday in Advent

Bible Sunday

By the Reverend Canon J. E. Fison, Truro

'We through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.'—Ro 15^4.

We might have; but have we? That is the question. The fog that is apt to settle down on our industrial areas at this time of the year is a parable of the hopeless fog that seems to have settled down on so many hearts and minds and consciences to-day.

In Browning's words, I 'feel the fog in my throat.' It grips and it clutches, and I cannot shake it off. 'Men's hearts' are 'failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth.' Whether it is a characteristic of middle age and old age or not, it has certainly got hold of a large part of our modern Western world. What are we to do about it?

There are three possibilities. We can let off a few intellectual fireworks. 'Fireworks in a fog' is not a bad description of some modern writers. They sparkle and dazzle for a minute or two, but they soon fizzle out. They don't last. Intellectual cleverness, however brilliant, is no real answer to 'the fog in my throat.'

Then there is FIDO. I think this was the code word for a very expensive procedure, which came into use during the War. Flares were lit on the side of aerodrome runways, so as to make the fog lift for a few minutes to enable aeroplanes to take off and land. Is not this a parable of the forced emotional stimulus of some mass meetings?

Such meetings are hard enough to get these days anyhow, but when you have got them, does their fervour last? Has it got any staying power within itself, or does the temperature constantly need to be artificially forced up by further doses of the original mixture? So often, when FIDO is turned off, the fog seems to come down thicker than ever.

If then intellectual fireworks and forced emotional heart-warming are not enough to dispel 'the fog in my throat', what can I do about it? Any

one who has ever taken off in an aeroplane on a foggy day knows the answer. All you have got to do is to get above the clouds and then, suddenly, unexpectedly, unbelievably, all the gloom is gone and you are out in the brilliant sunshine.

Of course, it is just the same if you climb a mountain, only it does not happen quite so quickly. You have got to get above the fog, or, if you can't do that, you have got to wait for the fog to lift—and get on with your job in the meantime.

This is where Bible reading is such a tremendous help. It takes you out of yourself; it lifts you above yourself. You find yourself in a new world and it is God's, and in the light of it you see that the old world you have come out of is God's world too—and so you can go back after your Quiet Time to tackle the chores and duties of everyday life with renewed zest, enthusiasm and hope.

'Hearts failing—heads up'—that is the tonic the Scriptures give us, if we read this Sunday's Epistle and Gospel. 'We through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.' Let us see how it works.

The spiritual masters teach us that it is only if we find ourselves out of our depth intellectually that we truly live by faith; and that it is only if we fail to get our own desires (even for the glory of God) that we begin to live in love. Similarly, they say, it is only if we 'lose our memory' that we find our hope. We cannot press this too far, but what exciting possibilities it suggests, when we think of what we call the tragedy of loss of memory in old age! Memory is the clue to hope. 'The fog in my throat' may be due to a foul memory. There are things in my past which I would do anything to forget, but I cannot. But what I cannot forget, God can and will forgive. This is the way to get rid of a foul memory, and it is the Scriptures which point it out. 'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.'

But it may not be a foul memory that causes 'the fog in my throat.' The trouble may be due to a fond memory that so clings to the past that it cannot live for the future. If the foul memory is a poison, the fond memory is a drug—wonderful for a time (like fireworks or FIDO), but deadly in the end. The drug of this fond and clinging memory is a major threat to our British way of life in Church and State to-day. While other nations are living for the future, we seem to be trying to cling on to the past.

But the Scriptures make it clear that the only way to safeguard the blessings of the past is not to cling on to them, but to entrust them to God and leave Him to give them back to us, ever renewed and transformed, as He sees we need. It was in the Garden on Easter morning that Jesus said to Mary Magdalen, 'Don't cling on to me'—'don't cling on, even to Me!' Think of what that meant to her then and what it should mean to us now.

The great Jewish rabbi, Dr. Leo Baeck, taught me its secret. I met him one lovely May evening in North London some ten years ago. After telling me how he had lost all his possessions in Germany before the War, he said, 'Seven' (I think it was 'seven') 'years ago I lost my wife and half of me is with her.'

It was not the words he said, but the words he did not say, which left an indelible impression on my mind. He was not clinging to the past; he was living for the future. 'Half of me is with her,' but the other half was not longing to be back with his wife in the past; it was eagerly awaiting the day in the future when they would both be reunited again.

The Scriptures can get rid of the poison of a foul memory and the drug of a too fond memory, because they provide the tonic of an expectant memory. That is the secret of the Advent hope—not the fearful prospect of being confronted by something or some one totally unknown, but the thrilling expectation of meeting some one face to face, whom you already know—however dimly. The hall-mark of such a hope is its element of surprise—fearful to those who have no inkling of the Saviour now, but thrilling to those who have just enough of an inkling to realize that, if on that Day we depend only on His mercy, so on this and every other day we should likewise so depend.

If I 'feel the fog in my throat' and 'men's hearts' are 'failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth,' one remedy is to 'search the scriptures' and find in Him of whom they speak the antidote both to the poison of the foul memory and to the drug of the fond memory in the tonic of the expectant memory.

In words, truer than perhaps Shakespeare knew,

Journeys end in lovers meeting,

but the hope that meeting should inspire is produced neither by intellectual fireworks, inspired perhaps by curiosity about the future, nor by any emotional heart-warming, artificially stimulated in the present, but by patient study turned into prayerful 'comfort of the Scriptures.' Bible reading with prayer is one way to get above the fog or, if not, to carry on till it lifts. 'We through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.' We might have—but have we? It is up to us. We have a sure remedy for hopelessness in our hands, if only we will take it.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT

Crocodiles and Bent Pins

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD G. NEWSHAM, M.A., HARTFORD, CONN., U.S.A.

'Can you draw out Leviathan with a fishhook.'—Job 41[1] (R.S.V.).

The description of the crocodile—for that is the meaning of Leviathan—in the Book of Job is one of the great descriptive writings in literature. In every phrase of it you can still, after all these centuries, sense the dread of a people who had cause to know his power, his invulnerability, his malignity. The writer vividly portrays the terror of all other creatures when the crocodile appears. He describes the trail of the crocodile left on the mire, as though its underparts must be as hard and sharp as potsherds. The spray breathed out of the creature's nostrils after submersion, seen in the red light of the sunset or the dawn, was as a flame-thrower. And his eyes, the one feature of this fierce beast visible in the water when his body was invisible, had something of the penetrating power of the sun. But it was the monstrous size, the savage strength, the terrible jaw, which made Leviathan the most dreaded of all creatures. Puny man had better watch his steps when the crocodile was rampaging. So the author of the Book of Job, with acid sarcasm, asks whether anybody is so naïve that he supposes he could fish for Leviathan with line and hook, and hope to land him and sell his meat by the pound in the fishmarket.

1. This classic description of Leviathan, and this sarcastic outburst of the writer, have not been preserved over the centuries as merely an interesting bit of pictorial verbalism. It has been preserved because the crocodile and the fish-hook are perpetually significant symbols to-day as yesterday. Even in Old Testament times Leviathan symbolized for the Hebrews two of their most dreaded foes—the Assyrians and the Egyptians. Later, Leviathan stood for the tyranny of the Roman Emperors and the cult of Emperor worship which threatened the infant Church of Christ with extinction.

Fifteen centuries pass. We come to the year 1651 in England. In that year there was published a book by an author of unquestionable genius, whatever the merit of his opinions. His name was Thomas Hobbes. He contended in his book that the only possible way of achieving an orderly, prosperous, secure society was to establish completely totalitarian government. The book was given the title *Leviathan*. And on the frontispiece of the first edition was the engraving of a giant. His body, which seemed at first glance to be clad in armour, was seen under closer scrutiny to be formed by a vast multitude of prostrate people. Over the head of this appalling giant, this Leviathan, are words in Latin from the Book of Job—'Upon earth there is not his like.'

It is rather a curious thing that in discussions of Totalitarianism to-day you very rarely hear the name of Hobbes and his book *Leviathan* ever mentioned. True, it made little impression on public opinion in the country of its origin, except to be abhorred. But Hobbes' ideas lived on, or were resurrected elsewhere. The crocodile and the fish-hook are perpetually significant symbols, yesterday and to-day. From Assyrians in the times of Isaiah, through the Roman Empire in the days of Peter and John, right on to the Kremlin to-day, Leviathan is a living name.

2. But there is more to be said than this. The heart of the matter lies rather here. When Paul told us that in this life of ours we are engaged in a spiritual warfare of so serious a nature that we cannot hope to stand unless we put on armour which only God Himself can supply, he was not indulging in rhetoric or exaggeration. He was facing fact. There are enemies of truth, enemies of justice, enemies of mercy and compassion, enemies of love. They embody themselves in gangsterdom, in racketeers, in terrorists, in men who rule by ruthlessness and not by law. There is an enemy who can corrupt even the Church itself; an anti-Christ who can devour humility, penitence, dependence upon God alone. There is an adversary of our souls, so that any of us who merely pray with the lips and not with the heart 'Deliver us from evil' must already be in danger of defeat, especially if we are supposing the evil from which we are most in danger is an external one and not an internal one, betraying the citadel from within.

If Paul exaggerated here, then the Christian gospel is just an idle tale. For is not the meaning of the Cross essentially this? That though God might conceivably have been able to create the universe and the physical frame of man as by a mere word 'Let there be light'—the creation of man as a brother of his fellow-man, the creation of men able to be called children of God is another story altogether. The gift of freedom, the gift of self-government, these are at once sublime and perilous endowments. In giving them to man God, if we may reverently say it, gambled—with His entire creative purpose as the stake. Nay, more than that—with all of Himself involved in the gamble that it was possible could be involved. God taking upon Himself the form and person of a man; facing the spitting, the scourging, the agony in the Garden, the betrayal, the denials, the nails, the spear, the Cross—that, and nothing less than that, if the world was to be redeemed from the powers of darkness, of evil and of death. God

took the adversaries to His purposes and to humanity's highest good as seriously as that.

3. But we don't believe it. We have almost lost to-day any glimmering of understanding what all this is about. That God in Christ was engaged in a battle to the death; that the Christian Church exists as the proof that the decisive battle has been won, but that Leviathan has still plenty of bite and deadly jaw-snap yet—all this we find uncongenial to our complacency. Strange, when psychology is busy revealing the dangerous depths below the surface of the human mind. Strange when we have seen evils we had supposed vanished for ever rising from the soil again.

Really, Jesus Christ took this business far too seriously. He should just have gone on teaching, lived to a ripe old age.

And those followers of His, don't you think they have all been a tiny bit extreme? Did they really need to spend themselves quite so fully for Christ's sake and His Kingdom? Won't it come to pass and overcome the kingdoms of the world by a gradual, educational, evolutionary process? Why all this pother about the gospel and the Church; about belonging to the Church and worshipping with regularity, as an even more important necessity than dining. What's all this urgency about putting on the whole armour of God; or about giving costingly of our substance to support Christian evangelism and Christian ministries of relief and succour at home and abroad?

Is it really as desperate a business as all this? Isn't the most important thing of all in contemporary life to get taxes reduced, to get television in our homes and a new model car on the road, and just as a sop to conscience spare a dole from our superfluity for all the constructive labours of international goodwill of the Church?

Where this, or anything remotely resembling this, is our attitude, then the sarcasm of the author of Job should awaken us from slumber. 'Canst thou draw out Leviathan with a fish-hook?'

4. In these days, critical because of the moral and spiritual crises they have brought to the entire world, God is calling us with urgency and deep concern to stop fooling. Only by personal involvement, by genuine and not phoney sacrifice; by identifying ourselves wholeheartedly on the side of Christ-like faith and hope and love, in full appreciation of the strength, the subtilty, the tirelessness, the all-out commitment of our adversaries—only so is our Christian name the real thing and not a fiction.

Rise up, O men of God!
  Have done with lesser things;
Give heart and soul and mind and strength
  To serve the King of kings.

Rise up, O men of God!
  The Church for you doth wait,
Her strength unequal to her task;
  Rise up and make her great.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT

Fullness of Joy

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D., TH.M., GLASGOW

'These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.' —Jn 15^{11}.

C. S. Lewis, so justly famous for his defence of Christianity, calls his autobiography *Surprised by Joy*. The title must have caused a few raised eyebrows among those outside the Church, for nothing could be more surprising to the man in the street than to find 'joy' the dominant characteristic of a Christian life. For this misunderstanding we, in the Church, must bear most of the blame. It is we who have often given the outsider the impression that Christianity is a kind of masochistic pessimism by belauding as sanctity what is really a disease of the human soul. Think of the dreadful self-tortures of the ancient anchorites, and of some of the mediæval monks. If the body be indeed the temple of the Holy Spirit, then these 'saints' were guilty of offering Him a very meagre and ruinous dwelling. Even in our own day the blasphemous suggestion is often made that to turn away from life in the world and from marriage and home is somehow to please God. The picture of the Heavenly Father, sometimes given, is of One who rejoices to prohibit to His children anything they may happen to like doing. In a recent issue of the *Time* magazine there was an account of the Penitentes, a self-torturing sect, found in New Mexico and Colorado. In Easter week these deluded men stage processions to village Calvaries 'some stripped to the waist with thorny cacti bound round their chests, some scourging themselves every few steps with sharp-bladed yucca leaves until the blood saturates their trousers . . . some of them crawl upon the sharp stones on lacerated knees and hands.' What a travesty this is of the sunny religion whose Founder said 'These things have I spoken unto you . . . that your joy might be full.'

No less far from the intentions of our Lord Jesus Christ is the dour suspicion of life, sometimes found in Protestant Christianity, and the prim condemnation of laughter. Black clothes, a lugubrious voice and a sour expression are assumed to be proof of piety. 'Much in sorrow, oft in woe,' we sing, or

' Rest comes at length ; though life be long and dreary.' Would it not be just as true to life and Christian experience to sing ' Much in laughter, oft in joy ' or ' Rest comes quite soon, for life is short though cheery ? '

Some of the thinkers most influential in our day have given powerful support to the cult of miserableness. Kierkegaard, the gloomy Dane, wrote typically of ' The Sickness unto Death.' Unamuno, the Spanish mystic, is intoxicated with ' The Tragic Sense of Life.' Jean Paul Sartre in Europe and Tillich in America are both essentially pessimistic, and to that extent deviate from the gospel. Even painters, sculptors and the like incline in the same direction. In our day, the favourite representations of Christ in ecclesiastical art owe too much to the tortured El Greco pictures of Him. The three-hundred-year-old protest of Campanella is still very much in order. In one of his sonnets he says that art is for ever portraying Christ upon the Cross, where He spent only a few hours, and not risen, with His foot set upon the stone that could not hold Him, the triumphant Conqueror He is and that for ever.

However these misunderstandings of our holy faith arose, they do not derive from the Gospels. St. Luke's Gospel begins with the angel saying ' Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people,' and it ends with the disciples returning to Jerusalem ' with great joy.' Throughout, we read of one to whom young children ran, whom common people listened to—and with gladness. There are times when we ought to be serious, no doubt even grave, but the distinctive note of real Christianity is joy.

2. Of course, in our day the danger may not be so much of a false asceticism, as of a false libertarianism. If the way of joy is not the way of self-tormenting, neither is it the way of self-indulgence. Basing on a mis-reading of psychology, many have made a cult of so-called self-expression, following their inclinations of the moment wherever they might lead. In point of fact, any reputable psychologist would admit that self-indulgence, the restless attempt to find self-satisfaction, is more dangerous to mental health than almost any other way of life. Only satiety and soul-weariness can come from perpetually doing what you want. There is no psychological danger in facing our desires and saying ' No ' to them. The only danger is if we fail to be frank with ourselves about them, or pretend that we're above such desires. The great need—the great psychological need—of children and young people in our day is for discipline, for some guiding lines, some certain authoritative moral rules amidst all the relativities and uncertainties of our dishevelled world. It is a perfectly true-to-life story, which tells of the child at a ' modern ' school, who said wearily one morning, ' Teacher, do we *have* to do what we want to-day ? ' Man cannot live on a basis of doing what he wants to do. That is the morality of the beast of the field, and man knows what the beasts do not know—that he must die. The philosophy of *carpe diem*, of eat, drink and be merry, is self-defeating. It becomes very quickly a ghastly, feverish attempt to escape from a fact which the empty life exposes more and more clearly each day—that it must end. It is not among Christians but among ' café ' society that the suicide rate is highest. Man cannot live as if there were no end to his pleasure, for well he knows that there is. If the way of the ascetic is miserable, no less so is that of the sensualist.

3. To do nothing I like is wrong. To do anything I like is equally wrong. Fullness of joy lies in neither direction, for both make the same error. They conceive of life in terms of what ' I like.' It makes little difference whether what ' I like ' is conceived negatively or positively. Life is not mine at all. It is God's, who gave it. The key to it is not unselfishness—for self is still in the middle of that word—nor is it selfishness ; it is Godliness. A life in which self bulks large, whether as something to be destroyed or something to be expressed, is a self-centred life and therefore joyless.

It is only when we learn to see life in terms of the will of God that we see it truly. ' In his will is our peace.' ' To do the will of Jesus this is rest.' ' Abide in me,' said Christ, ' and I in you.' ' If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love.' ' These things have I spoken unto you . . . that your joy might be full.'

If we see life so—in terms of the will and purpose of God for us—our days will not, any more than Christ's were, be a round of pleasure, but through all our days—through joy and sorrow, through health and disease, through good success and ill—there will be a peace at our hearts no strife can destroy, a joy no sorrow can dim.

Entre Nous

A Teacher on Preaching

It has been said that any man who is willing to set down his own personal experience of life can write an interesting, if not a great, book. That is why we hope that preachers and teachers will never cease to write books about preaching. There is no better help for the preacher than to be allowed to

share the experience of other preachers. *Royal Sacrament: The Preacher and His Message*, by Professor Ronald A. Ward, B.D., Ph.D. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 12s. 6d. net), is an excellent book on preaching. Dr. Ward has had experience of the parish ministry of the Church of England; he was Tutor in the London College of Divinity; he is now Professor of New Testament in Wycliffe College, Toronto. He, therefore, writes out of a wide experience, which gives him the right to speak.

Dr. Ward has wise words to say about theology and preaching. Brunner compares the work of the theologian to that of an analytical chemist who tests the food which is publicly offered for sale. Theology has propositions to be believed, but not necessarily a Divine Personality to be encountered and trusted—that is the province of religion. The theologian speaks of God as 'He'; the worshipper speaks of God as 'Thou'. Dr. Ward quotes Dr. Sydney Cave's reference to the three moments of theology. There are the moments of revelation, appropriation, and intellectual interpretation. To take a parallel—there is first the existence of a flower—that is *revelation*; we see the flower and we smell its perfume—that is *appropriation*; we then correctly botanically classify the flower—that is *intellectual interpretation*.

But Dr. Ward is very far from belittling theology. Theology is necessary to understand, to teach, and to defend the faith. As Phillips Brooks said: 'Doctrine is truth considered with reference to its being taught'. Dr. Ward himself magnificently explains the doctrine of the Second Coming. If history is going on for ever, that is merely boring. If history is going to fade away, that is anti-climax. If history is going to go round in circles, that is literally hope-less and God-less. The Second Coming insists that history has a climax, and that that climax will come when Jesus Christ is manifested as the Ultimate Authority, and when before Him every knee shall bow. It is not a question of Christ 'travelling through space', but 'a new mode of His presence'. We must not make too much of 'the scenery of the New Testament'. 'Certainly we must not visit the pyramids with a tape-measure'. But the fundamental idea of *climax* must be ever before us.

But theology also gives the preacher his material; in it he has a deposit which is the background of all his preaching.

And, third, theology gives the preacher his norm, and saves him from preaching his own private opinions as God's own truth.

But the fact remains that the preacher is prophet rather than theologian. Dr. Ward quotes a saying from Mr. Bruce Hutchison's book 'The Incredible Canadian', which is a study of the late W. L. Mackenzie King. On one occasion 'Parliament awaited a trumpet blast. From King it received a lawyer's brief'. It is a bad day when a congregation awaits a prophetic announcement and receives a lecture on theology.

Dr. Ward points out most illuminatingly that there are three stages in the study of any Scripture. There is *historical approach*, in which we find out what any passage meant when it was first uttered. There is *interpretation*, when we bring the whole of the Bible and of the Christian faith to the interpretation of the passage. And there is *individual appreciation*, when through the passage we hear God speaking personally to us. And none is more necessary than the last. 'Dr. Wheeler Robinson could say that "the Bible is written in invisible ink, until its hidden characters are brought out by personal experience"'.

This book is full of flashing things. 'As the mediæval writers used to say, God is in the world, but not shut in; He is outside the world, but not shut out; He is transcendent, immanent, intimate'. The picture of the salt (Mt 5^{13-16}) tells us that 'the Kingdom in its membership is to be both the saviour and the savour of society'. No man need pour scorn on the Nicene controversy as an argument about an *iota*. 'It is one thing to ask a man to *run* your business and quite another to ask him to *ruin* it'.

Just once in a while Dr. Ward's enthusiasm runs away with him. 'The peace of God', he has it, 'which overtops all mind will garrison your hearts and thoughts in Christ Jesus' (Ph 4^{7}). If it overtops it, it must be *above* it. How can it, then, *garrison* it? 'We have to wait nearly two thousand years for the illustration. Have we never heard of air cover? Ask any infantryman!' But Dr. Ward wrote that with a smile!

You do not need to agree with every word of a book in order to thank God for the burning enthusiasm of it.

This book has first-rate chapters on the use of literature, the use of the events and sights of daily life, the use of the Greek Testament; it has a lightning and breathless exposition of the Sermon on the Mount which is better than many a large volume.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.